

APR 27 1917

Volume XXXII

MAY, 1917

UNIV. OF MICH.
LICK Number 5

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

JAMES EUSTACE SHAW

CONTENTS

FORMAN, E. C.—The Manuscripts of Ariosto's Comedies and their Relation to the printed Editions,	257
CAMPBELL, KILLIS.—Gleanings in the Bibliography of Poe,	267
HANDSCHIN, CHARLES H.—Gottfried Keller and the Problem of Tragedy,	273
HODGES, JOHN C.—Two Otherworld Stories,	280
ADAMS, ELIZABETH D.—A Fragment of a Lord Mayor's Pageant,	285
WOOD, FRANCIS A.—Etymological Notes,	290

Reviews:—

L. H. ALEXANDER, A Practical Introduction to French.	
C. A. CHARDENAL, A Complete French Course. [<i>Gustav Gruenbaum.</i>]	292
FREDERICK W. C. LIEDER, Goethe's <i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> . [<i>Ernst Feise.</i>]	295
ROBERT M. MITCHELL, Heyse and his Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle. [<i>G. C. L. Riemer.</i>]	299
HUBERTIS M. CUMMINGS, The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio. [<i>Eleanor Prescott Hammond.</i>]	302
HUGO A. RENNERT, Bibliography of the Dramatic Works of Lope de Vega Carpio based upon the Catalogue of John Rutter Chorley. [<i>Milton A. Buchanan.</i>]	304

Correspondence:

GALPIN, STANLEY L.—The Influence of Environment in <i>Le Père Goriot</i> ,	306
IBERSHOFF, C. H.—Vitzliputzli,	308
STARCK, TAYLOR.—Vitzliputzli,	310
NORTHUP, CLARK S.—Byron and Gray,	310
BUELL, LLEWELLYN M.—Byron and Shelley,	312
VANN, W. H.—Two Borrowings of Wordsworth,	314
SCHULTZ, WILLIAM EBEN.—A Parallel in Literary Biography,	315

Brief Mention:—

GERTRUDE BUCK, The Social Criticism of Literature;—OTTO L. JIRI- CZEK, James Macpherson's <i>Fragments of Ancient Poetry (1760)</i> ;—TORILD A. ALNOLDSON, Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian; CARL A. KRAUSE, The Direct Method in Modern Languages,	316
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Forty Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

**A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)**

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$3.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$3.25
and \$3.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to Murray P. Brush; and for the Italian and Spanish Departments to J. E. Shaw. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays, and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH

35 West 32nd Street,

NEW YORK



OXFORD FRENCH SERIES

BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS

General Editor: Raymond Weeks, Ph. D.

THREE NEW TITLES

Beaumarchais, *Le Mariage de Figaro*

A Prose Comedy in Three Acts, edited, with introduction and notes, by
ERNEST F. LANGLEY.

Crown 8vo., cloth, pp. xlv + 261..... 75c.

Sand, *Le Marquis de Villemer*

Edited, with introduction and notes, by CHARLES E. YOUNG.

Crown 8vo., cloth, pp. ix + 221..... 60c.

Scribe and Legouv  , *Adrienne Lecouvreur*

Edited, with introduction and notes, by THEODORE ELY HAMILTON.

Crown 8vo., cloth, pp. xix + 200..... 60c.

Correspondence with teachers regarding these books is invited.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXII

MAY, 1917

NUMBER 5

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF ARIOSTO'S COMEDIES AND THEIR RELATION TO THE PRINTED EDITIONS

Very few of the manuscripts of Ariosto's comedies have been preserved, although at one time the plays were in great vogue and were often acted. Lodovico never allowed his comedies to be published; for in the early days of printing, when every publisher was a would-be author, a writer could not trust even a type-setter not to take liberties with his text. Except for a few printed editions of the prose versions of *I Suppositi* and *La Cassaria* which were "stolen" by vandal play-wrights from the stage representations of these pieces, the comedies of Ariosto, during his lifetime, existed solely in ms. form. As the later printing of the plays was not supervised by Ariosto, we naturally turn to the surviving mss. for precise information regarding the author's own handiwork, or for the exact text of the comedies as transcribed under his direction.

Of the mss. of Ariosto's comedies only two have hitherto been examined: *La Scolastica*, and *L'Imperfetta* (a recent discovery of Abdelkader Salza's). A third ms., *I Suppositi* in prose, has been overlooked.¹

The ms. of *La Scolastica*, which is incomplete, is in the *Biblioteca Comunale* of Ferrara, where it has long been known to students. It is described by A. Salza in the preface to his edition of *Gli Studenti*, Città di Castello, Lapi, 1915.

Ariosto never finished this his last play, popularly known as

¹Giuseppe Fatini (in G. S. L. It. LXVII, p. 420, n. 1) mentions having seen a Vatican ms. containing all the comedies. Prof. Pio Rajna has lately informed me of the existence of a Vatican ms. of the 17th century, which may be the same.

La Scolastica but which he called *I Studenti*.² About ten years after his death (1533) the play was finished by his son Virginio in both prose and verse, and by his brother Gabriele in verse.³ It is Gabriele's addition which we find in the Ferrara ms., together with his copy of the unfinished original. Gabriele called the completed comedy *La Scolastica*. Just where his ending joins *I Studenti* it has long been impossible to determine. The piece reads smoothly from start to finish; the joint is well knit.

The date of the ms. is probably between 1543 and 1547. G. B. Giraldi, in the dedication, dated April 20, 1543, of his work *Discorsi intorno al Comporre dei Romanzi* (Venezia, 1554) speaks of having seen Virginio's first version in prose,⁴ but makes no mention of Gabriele's redaction in verse; it is therefore possible that at that time Gabriele had not yet written his continuation. On January 15, 1547, Gio. Grapio published the first printed copy of *La Scolastica*. By comparing this edition with the Ferrara ms. it is readily seen that the ms. must precede Grapio's edition. Faults in versification, Lombardisms and bad spelling are plentiful in the part of the ms. composed by Gabriele, which do not exist in the printed edition. I believe the ms. of *La Scolastica* is one of Gabriele's earliest, written several years before 1547, while he was still writing and rewriting his continuation of *I Studenti*, striving to invent an ending worthy of its author.⁵

² *Lettere di L. Ariosto*, per cura di A. Cappelli, Milano, Hoepli, 1887. Letter CXIII, Dec. 17, 1532: "Gli è vero che già molt'anni ne principiai un' altra commedia la quale io nomino *I Studenti*; ma per molte occupazioni non l'ho mai finita."

³ G. B. Pigna: *I Romanzi*, Venezia, 1554: "Ma ne fece solo tre atti e tre scene, che mostrano al carattere d'aver appena avuto il primo abbozzamento. Ella fu poi finita da M. Gabriele suo fratello. E suo figlio con altro modo tutta in prosa la ridusse; et halla ora tutta intiera molto diligentemente in verso riportata."

⁴ L'ho veduta finita in prosa dal suo molto gentil figliuolo M. Virginio; e mi pare che se egli la ridurrà in verso, ella riuscirà degna di loda."

⁵ Gabriele's prologue:

"... Conoscevasi [Gab.]
Ei d'ingegno e di forze più debole,
Che non bisogna a simil esercitio.
Altro ci vuol ch'aver visto grammatica
Ed apparati gli accenti e le syllabe,
Studiato la *Poetica* d'Horatio,

Although the Ferrara ms. precedes Griphio's edition, it could not possibly have served Griphio as a base, as the two texts oppose to each other too many striking variants. For example:

Act IV, sc. 4, verse 76:

Griphio's edition:—Bar.

Hor su, non piu aspettami.

Gabriele's ms.:—Ba.

Se tu vuo andar, vatene.

Act IV, sc. 5, verses 5-8:

Edition:—La.

Io sono cosi Bartolo

Nel ventre di mia madre (perdonatime)

Stato stampato, che piu assai premano

E fatti de gli amici, che i miei proprii.

ms.:—La.

Io sono cosi Bartolo

Nel ventre de la madre, habbi pacientia,

Stampato, de gli amici piu mi premono

E fatti sempre che miei fatti proprii.

Act IV, sc. 5, verse 18:

Edition:—Poscia che l'ho veduto condescendere. . . .

ms.:—Havendolo veduto condescendere. . . .

All editions of *La Scolastica* earlier than Polidori's of 1857 are more or less directly traceable to Giolito's editions of 1553 and 1562, which are adaptations of Griphio's of 1547; and Griphio's in turn is believed to be founded on Gabriele's last and best redaction, which is now lost to us.⁶

The ms. of *L'Imperfetta*, until now almost unknown,⁷ has been studied and described for the first time by Abdelkader Salza in

E divorati quanti libri stampansi!

È bisogno che'l ciel per quel s'adoperi,

Ch'abbia da scriver versi e ornare i pulpiti

Di bei soggetti."

⁶ Polidori's edition of 1857 is the worst that has ever been published, except the ed. of 1883, Società Editrice Sonzogno, Milano, which is copied from it almost verbatim. Polidori combined the Ferrara ms., which he considered an autograph of Ariosto's, with an interleaved copy of Barotti's edition of 1741 (which contained variants of Griphio's edition and the Ferrara ms.) prepared by Barotti for his second edition of 1766, and with an interleaved copy of Griphio's edition made by Antonelli for A. Torri, which contained variants from Gabriele's ms., as well as from the three 16th century editions of 1547, 1553, and 1562 (see Salza, *Gli Studenti*, 1915, *Prefazione*, xxxiii, xxxiv).

⁷ See Mazzatinti-Pintor's *Inventari dei MSS. delle Bibl. d'Italia*, XIII, p. 27.

his recent interesting and valuable critical edition of *Gli Studenti* already mentioned.

We know that Virginio Ariosto made an ending for *I Studenti*, first in prose and afterwards in verse, before Gabriele wrote his version; and that he called the completed comedy *L'Imperfetta*.⁸ Virginio's versions in prose and verse were never printed, and until lately both were believed to be lost, with the exception of his prologue in verse, which was first published by Barotti in 1741. (*Opere di Ariosto*, Pitteri.) Salza believes, for two reasons, that in this newly-found ms. we have Ariosto's *I Studenti* combined with Virginio's ending in verse. 1. The ms. contains Virginio's prologue and not Gabriele's. 2. As far as v. 12 of scene 2, Act IV, the ms. follows the text of Lodovico's *I Studenti* (except for some variants) but from this point continues in a manner altogether different from that of Gabriele's addition.

L'Imperfetta, as Salza points out, was finished by Virginio in verse between 1551 and 1554. Barotti, in his notes on *La Scolastica* (Ven. Pitteri, 1741), claimed to have in his possession an original letter to Virginio Ariosto from Virginio's cousin, Giulio Guarini of Modena, dated Feb. 11, 1551, in which Guarini declines the task of turning Virginio's *prose* ending of *Gli Studenti* into *versi sdrucchioli*, which Virginio has apparently urged upon him. This letter, if genuine, proves that Virginio could not have written his continuation in verse before February, 1551. Pigna, in his work published in 1554,⁹ says that Virginio has turned it (*Gli Studenti*) into verse. By 1554, then, Virginio's redaction in verse was known.

Salza does not take up the matter of the date of the ms. he has discovered, which is a copy or derivative of Virginio's, beyond saying that it belongs to "about the middle of the 16th century."

Gli Studenti is by no means the only play of Ariosto's that presents striking differences in its various early texts. As Ariosto's comedies were never printed under his supervision, the reliability of all the early editions of these pieces is bound to be more or less doubtful. *Il Negromante*, published two years after Ariosto's

* Virginio's prologue, opening verses:

"Vengo a voi solo per farvi conoscere
Il nome dell'autor di questa fabula,
Che *La Imperfetta* con ragion si nomina."

⁹ G. B. Pigna: *I Romanzi*, Venezia, 1554: cf. above, note 3.

death under Virginio's direction,¹⁰ contains such remarkable variants of Giolito's text of 1551, that we can only suppose the two editions were founded on two separate MSS.¹¹ The same thing is true of *La Lena*, though in less degree. But the two plays that present the most striking difficulties as regards determining their origin are those first composed by Ariosto,—*La Cassaria* and *I Suppositi*. These prose comedies were played in 1508 (*La Cassaria*), and 1509 (*I Suppositi*) at Ferrara, and obtained at once immense popularity. During Ariosto's life-time they were stolen by actors and printed in six unauthorized editions, to Lodovico's great displeasure.

The *Biblioteca Classense* of Ravenna contains a manuscript of Ariosto's *I Suppositi* in prose. It is believed that no description of this MS. has ever been published; nor is there any record of it in the most reliable and best-known bibliographies with the exception of Mazzatinti-Pintor's *Inventari dei MSS. delle Biblioteche*

¹⁰ Archivi di Stato di Venezia, Registro n. 28, Senato I, Terra, 1534-1535, c. 122:

"M. D. XXXV de mense Aprilis. Serenissimo Principe et Illustrissimo Signoria. Havendo li heredi del quondam Messer Ludovico Ariosto da Ferrara ottenuto licentia dalli Excellentissimi signori capo [sic] del consiglio di X di poter far stampare alcune Comedie, . . . di esso messer Ludovico, le qual desiderano porre in luce, accio che delle honeste vigilie sue piu tosto che li Extranei, detti heredi conseguano qualche utile, in parte di ricompensa della iactura fatta della smorte [sic] sua; humilmente supplicano a vostra Sublimita et Signorie che se degnino farli gratia, che per Dieci Anni proximi futuri non sia licito ad alcuno in cita, Terra, e loco . . . stampare, ne far stampar, vender, ne far vender, alcuna de ditte opere, senza expressa licentia de' ditti heredi, sotto pena de perder tutti li libri stampati, et de mille ducati. . . . Ottenendo li heredi questa gratia, come sperano, lo reconoscera [sic] a perpetuo obbligo da vostra Serenita. Die viii Aprilis.

"Quod suprascriptis supplicantibus concedatur quod petunt. Voti del si, 112; del no. 12; dubbio, 8."

¹¹ Salvatore Bongi, *Annali di Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari*, Roma, 1890: "Sono già alcuni anni che l'erudito bibliofilo Teodorigo Landoni ci scriveva queste parole: 'Giosuè Carducci ed io confrontammo il *Negromante* del Giolito colla stampa indicato come prima dal Gamba [1535]. L'Ariosto non fece qualche cambiamento, come si diceva, ma rifiuse tutto il componimento con improba fatica; tanto che disegnammo di darne una edizione possibilmente a riscontro di tutte due, affinchè si vedesse con quanta cura e sudore quell'alto ingegno si faticava intorno ai suoi lavori.' Non crediamo però che questo disegno si portasse ad effetto."

d'Italia, where it is noted in vol. iv, page 195, as *I Suppositi di Lod. Ariosto (Fol. 120-137)*. This characterization is correct as far as it goes; but not even a date is suggested, while a very important fact, i. e., that the ms. is Ariosto's prose version and not his redaction in verse, is not recorded.

This ms. is not written in Ariosto's hand. It is a fragment, contained in a collection of miscellaneous mss. known simply, in the ms. library catalogue, as *Manoscritto 209*. The volume contains, besides *I Suppositi*, verses by Pietro Barignani of Brescia, Nicolò Amanio, Jacopo Sannazzaro, Pietro Bembo and Giangiorgio Trissino. *I Suppositi* occupies 18 leaves of paper, each measuring 139 x 200 mm. The 18 written leaves are preceded by one blank sheet and followed by two. The first eight written leaves are signed in order: A. i. ii. iii. iiiii., B. i. ii. iii. iiiii., after which the series is not continued. These signatures are by the same hand that copied the text. There is no numbering of scenes or acts. Five leaves at the end of the ms. have been cut out, and the piece stops abruptly with the words of Erostrato in scene 2 of Act v: *ha pasyphilo e questa la fede che io ho in te*.

In order to understand precisely what relation this ms. bears to the printed editions, it will be necessary to review briefly the early history of the play.

Before he staged *I Suppositi* (1509) Ariosto had already in the preceding year attained distinction as a playwright by his production before the court of Ferrara of *La Cassaria* in prose. *I Suppositi* brought him even greater dramatic success, and placed him at once at the head of a little band of writers of prose-comedies. The only comedy of the time that can rank with Ariosto's plays is Machiavelli's *La Mandragola*; and this was written in 1513, several years after *La Cassaria* and *I Suppositi*. Lodovico Ariosto was thus not only the greatest epic poet of his age, but also a pioneer in the field of comedy. He was the first Italian dramatist to break with tradition and to write plays modelled, it is true, after the Latin comedies, as was the fashion of the time, but nevertheless thoroughly modern in substance. *I Suppositi* in prose is the first genuinely modern production in the history of Italian comedy.

Ariosto wrote his first two plays, *La Cassaria* and *I Suppositi*, in prose. Later, as his genius developed and he became more independent, he invented the clever unrhymed *endecasillabo sdruciolato*

verse, imitating the Latin iambic trimeter which Horace calls the metre *par excellence* of comedy.¹² In this new metre he wrote the rest of his comedies: *Il Negromante*, *La Lena* and *I Studenti* (uncompleted). Twenty years after he had composed them in prose he turned *La Cassaria* and *I Suppositi* into *versi sdrucchioli*. He was eager to do this because the two earlier pieces in prose had been stolen by actors and vandal play-wrights, and had been very badly printed in various spurious editions. On March 18, 1532, he wrote to Duke Frederick of Mantua, who had asked for his four completed comedies to be played at the great carnival which was to be held in honor of the visit of the Emperor Charles V: "Due ci sono che non credo che quella [V. Signoria] abbia più vedute; l'altre, ancora che sieno a stampa per colpa di persone che me le rubaro, non sono però nel modo in che le ho ridotte; massimamente *la Cassaria* che tutta è quasi rinnovata . . . Quella supplico che sia contenta di non lasciarle andare in modo che sieno stampate un'altra volta, che . . . non credo che le stampassino più corrette che abbian fatto l'altre volte." In the same strain he wrote to Giovan Giacomo Calandra, warden of the castle of Mantua and the Duke's secretary: "Oltre quello ch'io ne scrivo al Sig. Duca, Vostra Signoria lo pregherà da mia parte, che, per inavvertenza di chi avrà le commedie nelle mani, non si lascino sicchè vadano a stampa, come sono andate delle altre volte con mio gran dispiacere."¹³

These stolen editions are:

1. Unsigned and undated. 4to.¹⁴
2. 1524, Roma, 27 Settembre. 12mo.¹⁵

¹² Cf. E. G. Gardner, *Ariosto the King of Court Poets*, London, 1906: p. 331, n. 2. H. Hauvette, *Littérature Italienne*, Paris, 1910: p. 254.

¹³ See letters clxxxiii and clxxxii, ed. Cappelli: Milano, Hoepli, 1887.

¹⁴ A copy of this play at Ferrara has inscribed on the fly-leaf: "Ferrara, pel Massocco, 1516. Così è giudicato."

¹⁵ Brunet says: "Entre autres éditions que M. Gamba cite de la même pièce [*I Supp.* in prose] il s'en trouve une de Rome, in-12, sans nom d'imprimeur, à la fin de laquelle se lit, 'Finisce la commedia di Lodovico Ariosto Ferrarese, restituta alla sua vera lezione dopo la scrittura scorrettissima di Siena.' Ce qui suppose une édition antérieure (de Sienne), probablement celle de 1523, in-8, citée dans la *Bibliografia de' Classici Italiani*, imprimée à Milan en 1814."

There is no other evidence that the edition of 1523, Siena, ever existed. None of the copies of the "1524" editions examined by me contains "Finisce," etc. The only word following the text, in each case, is *Valete*.

3. 1525, Venezia, Zoppino. 4to.
4. 1526, Arimino, Soncino. 12mo.
5. 1526, Venezia, da Sabbio. 8vo.
6. 1526, Venezia, Bindoni & Pasini. 8vo.¹⁶

We know, then, that none of the printed texts of *I Suppositi* in prose was made under Ariosto's direction; and further, that the mss. on which these texts were founded were the copies used in stage representations. If our ms., then, were one of these stage copies, it would seem of greater value than the printed texts in indicating what Ariosto actually wrote or superintended writing. It has indeed every appearance of having been used in performances, and lacks the elegance and careful preparation of a document intended for ordinary reading, such as the Magliabechian ms. of *L'Imperfetta*. The acts, though clearly separated, are indicated whimsically, as though by some hasty and unliterary stage-manager. At the end of Act I we find: *Explicit primus actus incipit secundus Dulyppo e Errostrato*. At the beginning of Act III is written: *principit tertius actus Dalio coco Crapino ragazzo Errostrato Dulipo*; at the beginning of Act IV, *quartus actus Errostrato solo*; at the beginning of Act V, *Actus quintus Errostrato solo*. Another feature which leads us to believe that we have here an actors' copy, is an *Argumentum*, or explanation of the piece, which presents the characters one by one, giving some slight description of each. Such an *Argumentum* would be likely to appear only in a ms. intended for stage production.

Nevertheless the ms. is probably not faithful to the original text: there is no possible relation between this ms. and those of other plays prepared or supervised by the author. Ariosto's numbering of acts was always consistent and in good form (See Giolito's editions of 1551, copied from Ariosto's mss.). His plays invariably contain casts—*persone della commedia*; our ms. has no such cast, and never has had, for the numbering of the leaves, by the same hand that copied the text, begins with the *Argumentum* and continues without a break for eight leaves. The existence of the *Argumentum* is itself suspicious, for as far as we know, Ariosto

¹⁶ Between Ariosto's death in 1533 and the present time, 24 editions have been published, all founded on the earlier incorrect and stolen copies of Ariosto's day.

never composed an *Argumentum* or anything resembling one. This ms. differs from all of the early printed texts derived from the stage mss. in omissions of words and differences in spelling; sometimes a whole sentence found in the editions is absent here. But the most striking difference is that the editions contain Ariosto's prologue, which is omitted by the ms., although, for reasons previously stated, it could not have been lost.

The printed texts of *I Suppositi* in prose were founded on actors' ms. copies. Our ms. is evidently no such authorized copy, and since it contains an *Argumentum*, which is not in any of the printed editions, and is without the prologue which all the editions have, it seems clear that it is not the source of any of the printed editions.

On the contrary, the ms. is certainly a derivative of one of the printed texts. This fact is established by the presence of the signatures "A. i. ii. iii. iiiii." and "B. i. ii. iii. iiiii."—a peculiarity which is characteristic of printed editions, but not of manuscripts.

But if our ms. is derived from one or more of the printed editions, why does it not contain the prologue, and why is it otherwise so different from them?

The 16th century editions of *I Suppositi* in prose not already enumerated are as follows:

7. 1536, Venezia, M. Sessa. 8vo.
8. 1537, " Bindoni & Pasini. 8vo.
9. 1538, " Zoppino. 8vo.
10. 1540, " Gio. Paduanno. 8vo.
11. 1542, " Bindoni & Pasini. 8vo.
12. 1587, " B. Rubin. 12mo.

The 1587 edition is the last of its century; there is no other until 1730 when Orlandini made his handsome folio edition. These twelve editions have many characteristics in common with each other, such as acts being numbered, *but not scenes*; and with the ms., such as the absence of any cast.

An important factor in the problem is that our ms. contains a typographical peculiarity—the words *Seconda Scena* in Act II, which were not printed in the first two editions, but which appear (in inverted order: "*Scena Seconda*") in the third edition (1525), and in all those subsequent except the last of the series (1587). We at once see that there must be some relation between our ms. and those editions which contain the words *Scena Seconda*; and

we may infer that our ms. is derived from one or more of them. If so, our ms. belongs most probably to the years between 1525 and 1551, after which, with the printing of Ariosto's second redaction of *I Suppositi* in verse, interest in the old prose version vanished. We may suppose that the prologue was omitted as unsuitable to the small or private audience for which the ms. was being prepared, and that the writer therefore substituted an *Argumentum* of his own.

Some explanation is needed of the logical development of Zoppino's edition of 1525, which is the first to contain the words "*Scena Seconda*," from the earlier editions which do not contain them. In the first place, Zoppino's edition of 1525 was probably not copied from either of the two earlier editions. His prologue shows many changes in the text; the names of the people in the play are spelled differently; the speeches of the *persone* reveal material differences; the leaves are numbered for the first time. Indeed, this edition of 1525 seems to be an entirely independent production: whence, then, was its text derived? Presumably from some practical actors' ms. copy which contained a heading for each scene, as *Scena Prima*, *Scena Seconda*, *Scena Terza*, etc. Zoppino's type-setter, probably instructed to omit these superfluous headings, which were needed only for clearness in a stage production, must have negligently retained one—*Scena Seconda*, which, through nine other editions, was mechanically reproduced by other unthinking type-setters.

As it has never been published before, I hereto append the text of the *Argumentum* found in the ms. of *I Suppositi* in the Ravenna library.

ARGUMENTUM¹⁷

Silentio Spectatori siamo per nararvi una noua comedia et se quel favore che per humanità al altre comedie havete prestatato non negarete [a] questa, mi confido che non sia per compiacervi

¹⁷ All punctuation in the original ms. is indicated by lines. There are no accents. Most of the proper names begin with small letters and in some cases common nouns begin with capitals. The original contains various ligatures, here written out in full.

I am indebted to Sig. Santi Muratori of the *Biblioteca Classense*, of Ravenna, especially for the opportunity to reproduce the *Argumentum*, and also to the unfailing courtesy of Sig. Giuseppe Agnelli of the *Biblioteca Comunale* of Ferrara.

meno. Erostrato gionto in Ferara per dar opera ali studii, et innamoratosi di Polymnesta, prende l'habito di Dulippo suo seruo, et però cangia il nome et la conditione, et per seruo si mete di Damone patre di Polymnesta la qual di pare amore amando Erostrato, et per mezzo di una sua nutrice giacendo in seme, si ingravidò. Cleandro vechio et doctore ama medesimamente Polymnesta, et per [m]ezanità di Pasiphilo parasito, et con promessa di sopradote procura haverla per sua molgie. Erostrato riputato Dulippo, per obstarre ali pensieri del doctore, fa che Dulippo riputato Erostrato cerchi anche esso hauer Polymnesta per sposa, facendo li partiti a Damone et li promesse maggiori di soura dota; et per tal effetto opera che un forestiero senese seli finge patre, et lo fa chiamar Philogano di Catania. Lo innamorato per disturbar el maritaggio de il vechio doctore semina con sui falsi trovati gran discordia tra il ditto vechio doctore et il parasito. Damon presente da sua figliola esser stata compresa dal reputato Dulippo suo seruo, lo fa prender in casa sua et incarcerare. In questa [ora] a caso ariua in Ferrara Philogano uero per riveder suo figliolo Erostrato, et cercando lo ritroua in forma che [sic] esso Dulippo suo seruo, che chiamar si fa Erostrato, et il senese in forma di sè stesso, et ripputa il suo figliolo morto, et ha ricorso a Cleandro doctore per uendicarsi de l'onta riceuuta. Il qual Cleandro ne li ragionamenti di Philogano ritroua per euidenti segni il vero Dulippo esser suo filgio. Philogano ritroua Erostrato; Damone lo rende [a] suo patre, et si lo fa genero. Dixi.

E. C. FORMAN.

Haverford, Pa.

GLEANINGS IN THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF POE

1. Of the seventy-one stories from the pen of Poe, the place of first publication of all except two—*The Spectacles* and *The Premature Burial*—has been pointed out by one or another of Poe's editors. I have recently stumbled upon the place of first publication of these two. *The Spectacles* appeared in the Philadelphia *Dollar Newspaper* for March 27, 1844, and *The Premature Burial* in the same paper (a weekly) for July 31, 1844. A file of the *Dollar Newspaper* covering the years 1843-45 has lately come into the possession of the Maryland Historical Society at Baltimore.

This file also supplies the original text of *The Gold Bug*, advertised by the latest editors of Poe's tales as inaccessible,¹ though contemporary newspaper notices had made it plain that it was

¹ *Virginia Poe*, II, p. 305.

published in the *Dollar Newspaper* (for June 21 and June 28, 1843), having been awarded a prize of a hundred dollars offered by that newspaper. The story as originally published contains two illustrations by Darley, one showing Legrand and his companions at work in the treasure pit, the other exhibiting the treasure after it had been laid bare. The issue of June 28 contains the story in its entirety, and it was again published, in a prize-story supplement, on July 12, 1843.²

2. A dozen years before the publication of *The Gold Bug*, as I have elsewhere shown,³ Poe submitted five or his stories to the Philadelphia *Saturday Courier*, in competition for another hundred-dollar prize, to be won in this instance, by a curious irony of fate, not by Poe, but by Delia Bacon, of Shakespeare-Bacon notoriety. Even before this, however, Poe had formed the habit of submitting his verses to the magazines. In September, 1829, a part of his fantastic lyric, *Fairy-Land*, appeared in John Neal's journal, *The Yankee and Boston Literary Gazette*, being there pronounced to be "nonsense, [though] rather exquisite nonsense."⁴ A month later the same poem was publicly rejected by N. P. Willis through the columns of the *American Monthly Magazine*. Willis's comment is interesting both as displaying his characteristic jauntiness and as reflecting the contemporary estimate in which Poe was held. He prefaces his notice with the statement that he finds much pleasure in destroying rejected manuscripts of bad verses, and in particular in watching them as they burn "within the fender." "It is quite exciting," he writes, "to lean over eagerly as the flame eats in upon the letters, and make out the imperfect sentences and trace the faint strokes in the tinder as it trembles in the ascending air of the chimney. There, for instance, goes a gilt-edged sheet which we remember was covered with some sickly rhymes on Fairy-land. The flame creeps steadily along the edge of the first leaf, taking in its way a compliment to some by-gone nonsense-verses of our own, inserted in brackets by the author to conciliate our good

² Poe's stories, *The Tell-Tale Heart* and *The Oblong Box*, published in the *Dollar Newspaper*—in the issues of January 25, 1843, and August 28, 1844—appear to be merely copies of earlier texts, though *The Oblong Box* as there published has the sub-title, "A Capital Story."

³ *The Dial*, February 17, 1916 (LX, p. 146).

⁴ *Virginia Poe*, VII, p. 257.

will. Now it flashes up in a broad blaze, and now it reaches a marked verse—let us see—the fire devours as we read:

‘They use that moon no more
For the same end as before—
Videlicet, a tent,
Which I think extravagant.’

Burn on, good fire!”⁵

The “sickly rhymes” here quoted by Willis are lines 35-38 of Poe’s *Fairy-Land*. In justice to Willis, it should be added that another of his magazines, *The New Mirror*, published (in its issue of May 7, 1831) one of the earliest and one of the fairest of the contemporary notices of Poe’s verses, and that he proved in Poe’s darker years the staunchest and truest of his literary friends.

3. Among minor prose articles not heretofore attributed to Poe, but demonstrably his work, are the following:

a. A half-column notice of the *Southern Literary Messenger* in the *Baltimore Republican* of May 14, 1835. Poe’s authorship of this item is established by a letter of his, of May 30, 1835, to the proprietor of the *Messenger*, T. W. White (*Virginia Poe*, xvii, p. 6).

b. Brief notices of the *American Almanac* and *English Annals* in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for December, 1835 (ii, p. 68). These are shown to be Poe’s by a letter of T. W. White’s published in J. H. Whitty’s edition of Poe’s poems (p. 179). The same letter confirms B. B. Minor’s ascription to Poe of the notices of the *Westminster Review*, the *London Quarterly Review*, and the *North American Review*, in the same number of the *Messenger* (pp. 59-64).⁶

c. The review of *The Magazines* for June, 1845, in the *Broadway Journal* of May 17, 1845 (i, pp. 316-17). The note on *Graham’s Magazine* has to do mainly with Hoffman’s biographical sketch of Griswold which appeared in the current number of that magazine, and is evidently the article referred to in a letter of Poe’s, printed by Griswold (i, p. xxii), as “my notice of C. F. Hoffman’s sketch of you.” The item is of interest as showing that Poe, although naturally antipathetic to Griswold, was not incapable of saying a good word for him when he felt that occasion offered.

⁵ *American Monthly Magazine*, November, 1829 (i, pp. 586-87).

⁶ *Southern Literary Messenger*, 1834-1864, p. 37.

d. A note concerning an alleged plagiarism by Whittier, under the heading *Editorial Miscellany*, in the *Broadway Journal* for September 20, 1845. This is in part identical with No. 188 of the *Marginalia* as printed by Griswold (III, p. 570).

e. A review entitled *Mrs. Lewis' Poems* in the *Western Quarterly Review* for April, 1849 (I, pp. 404-8). This article was published anonymously, but is partly a recast by Poe of his notice of Mrs. Lewis's poems in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for September, 1848. Poe refers to this paper (though he does not specifically acknowledge it) in a letter to Mrs. Clemm of September 5, 1849 (*Virginia Poe*, xvii, p. 369).

f. An interesting letter of Poe's, printed in George Lippard's *Herbert Tracy* (Philadelphia, 1844, pp. 167 f.). This letter, which bears date Feb. 18, 1844, and is addressed to Lippard, is devoted mainly to a criticism of Lippard's *Ladye Annabel*, but contains also some friendly counsel as to how an author should conduct himself when attacked by undiscerning and unscrupulous critics. "Let a fool alone—especially if he be both a scoundrel and a fool," advises Poe, "and he will kill himself far sooner than you can kill him by any active exertion. . . . I have never yet been able to make up my mind whether I regard as the higher compliment, the approbation of a man of honor and talent, or the abuse of an ass or a blackguard."

4. In addition to the foregoing, I wish to call attention to two items which I cannot prove to be Poe's, but which are, I think, entitled to consideration as being perhaps the work of his hand.

a. The first of these is a gruesome story, entitled *A Dream*, published over the signature "P." in the *Philadelphia Saturday Evening Post* of August 13, 1831. The story purports to be an account of a dream in which the writer fancies himself as witnessing the "dying agonies of the God of Nature," and later as wandering into the "burial ground of the monarchs of Israel," where he is so much frightened by the apparition of the ghost of one of the buried kings of Israel that he suddenly awakes from his dream. A part of the concluding paragraph, describing the vision of the buried king of Israel, will serve best for illustration.

"'Twas a hideous, unearthly form, such as Dante in his wildest flights of terrified fancy, ne'er conjured up. I could not move, for terror had tied up volition. It approached me. I saw the grave-worm twining itself among the matted locks which in part covered

the rotten scull. The bones creaked on each other as they moved on the hinges, for its flesh was gone. I listened to their horrid music, as this parody on poor mortality stalked along. He came up to me; and, as he passed, he breathed the cold damps of the lonely, narrow house directly in my face. The chasm in the heavens closed; and, with a convulsive shudder, I awoke."

The resemblance here, both in matter and in style, to Poe's fully authenticated work is plain. We have already noted that the item is subscribed with the initial "P." It should also be noted that Poe was on terms of friendly acquaintance with one of the assistant editors of the *Post*, L. A. Wilmer, at the time of (or shortly before) the publication of this story, and that, through his influence, presumably, the *Post* had, in September, 1830, and in May, 1831, published in its columns two of Poe's early poems.⁷ It may be added that the hackneyed device with which the story ends is employed also in the *dénouement* of Poe's *The Angel of the Odd* and *The Premature Burial*. But it should be said, on the other hand, that neither a similarity in style nor the presence of the initial "P." nor any merely circumstantial evidence can furnish adequate ground for ascribing unreservedly to Poe an item not otherwise authenticated.⁸

b. The second dubious item to which I wish to direct attention is a fragment of verse published anonymously in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for March, 1835 (I, p. 370), under the title, *Extract from an Unfinished Poem*. The poem begins as follows:

There is a form before me now,
A spirit with a peerless brow,
And locks of gold that lightly lie,
Like clouds on the air of a sunset sky,
And a glittering eye, whose beauty blends
With more than mortal tenderness,
As bright a ray as Heaven sends
To light those orbs where the pure and blest
Are taking their eternal rest.

⁷ *To Science* (published in the issue of September 11, 1830), and *To Helen* (in the issue of May 21, 1831).

⁸ In an article entitled *The Poe Canon* (*Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXVII, p. 334) I have called attention to a number of items of Poe's time which are subscribed with the initial "P.", but which are surely not the work of his hand. The list there given is by no means exhaustive.

Sweet Spirit! thou hast stolen afar
 From thy home in yonder crystal Star
 That I might look on thee, and bless
 Thy kindness and thy loveliness.

The rest of the poem is in much the same strain. In diction and tone the piece manifestly resembles Poe's early long poem, *Tamerlane*; the mention in lines 10 and 11 of a "sweet spirit" stolen from a "crystal star" suggests another of his early poems, *Al Aaraaf*; and there is a slight verbal correspondence (though the wording is obviously conventional) between lines 8 and 9:

. . . where the pure and blest
 Are taking their eternal rest,

and lines 4 and 5 of *The City in the Sea* (1831):

Where the good and the bad and the worst and the best
 Have gone to their eternal rest.

Moreover, it has been made fairly plain that Poe did contribute to the *Messenger* verses that he was later unwilling to admit into the collective edition of his poems (1845): Professor Woodberry has suggested—and the suggestion seems a highly plausible one⁹—that the lines entitled *Ballad* in the *Messenger* for August, 1835, are in reality an early version of Poe's *Bridal Ballad*; and Mr. Whitty¹⁰ assigns to Poe the lines *To Sarah* in the *Messenger* of the same month.

Here again, however, it ought to be said that similarities in manner and phrasing are, as a rule, inadequate as a basis for an unqualified ascription of authorship; hence I do not wish to be understood as holding that either of these items is surely Poe's. I have drawn attention to them, nevertheless, in the hope that some other student of Poe may be able to demonstrate conclusively their authorship.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

University of Texas.

⁹ *Works of Poe*, ed. Stedman and Woodberry, x, p. 161.

¹⁰ *Poems of Poe*, ed. J. H. Whitty, pp. 142, 286.

GOTTFRIED KELLER AND THE PROBLEM OF TRAGEDY

Keller reached Heidelberg in the fall of 1848, where Spinoza's teaching was interpreted for him by Hermann Hettner, and where the fairly materialistic atmosphere of such men as Moleschott, Henle, and Kapp enveloped him. All of these influences, however were welded into one when he came under the sway of Ludwig Feuerbach.

Feuerbach had started out as a follower of the Hegelian speculative philosophy, but in the thirties had come out with his own, quite anti-Hegelian doctrine of naturalism. From the mazes of subjectivism, a return to nature. The senses take the place of the abstract egoistic starting point. In this you will note he is in accord with modern psychology; nothing in consciousness which was not before in the senses; and in accord with modern metaphysics, which asserts that the theory of knowledge is prerequisite to all philosophy. But the theory of knowledge since the days of Kant and Hume has shown a decided tendency to begin and to end with psychology. And psychology bases upon sensation. Feuerbach has, then, the thoroly modern conception, altho we may not say that he makes psychology the arbiter in the theory of knowledge.

Here, then, is a return to that doctrine of the full living out of the personality, to that Hellenic joy in sense, with emphasis on the present moment, which characterized the classic period of German literature. This is the natural reaction of an age of natural science and psychology against the subjective philosophy which had dominated German thought for two generations.

After romantic spiritualism the spiral is returning to that *Sinnenfreudigkeit*, and that humanism, at which Goethe, by dint of a strong and naive personality, had arrived intuitively. This present life is more to these men than the life to come, just as it was to the Greeks.

In Feuerbach there is also the anti-Christian ferment, which, however, is only incidental, not *essential*, to his philosophy, and was useful as an aid in recalling the generation from the abstract and supermundane to themselves. Man should, says Feuerbach, have the motive of his doing, the objects of his thought, and the

panacea for his evils and sufferings, not outside of himself, like the heathen, nor above and beyond himself, like the Christian, but within himself.¹

And while the common lexicons set this down as materialism, it was in effect idealism, or at least an idealized materialism, the practical proof of which statement is that the characteristic materialists of the age, for instance Max Stirner, had no keener opponent than our philosopher. Feuerbach was too much of a practical philosopher anyway to trouble much about the question of the substance and the idealistic hypotheses. His emphasis was placed upon human weal and woe, upon the ideal and human conduct. The influence of Feuerbach's teachings in German life and thought has not yet been fully evaluated, but is coming with every year to be more and more so. Indeed his recent exponents, competent authorities in philosophy, assert that the time will come when Wagner and Nietzsche will have to return to its original source much of their glory when Feuerbach again comes into his own.² The materialism of the age was thoroly idealized in Feuerbach, and in this Keller followed him.

In discussing Keller's attitude towards tragedy, now, we need to call to mind that his early works tend to end tragically, *e. g.*, *Der grüne Heinrich*, *Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe*, and especially *Theresa*, a dramatic fragment, conceived probably under the influence of Hebbel's *Maria Magdalena*. All of these were conceived not later than 1847 to 1849, and Keller never again wrote a tragic work, or a work with a tragic end, with the exception of *Regina* in the *Sinngedicht*, planned in 1851. And, while we cannot, here, go into the various changes later introduced into these works, I wish merely to state the fact that the tragic in the above mentioned works was either changed to a happy ending, as in the revised edition of *Der grüne Heinrich* and in *Dorotheas Blumenkörbchen* in the *Sieben Legenden*, or remained uncompleted, as *Theresa*, except in the case of *Romeo und Julia*, and *Regina*, where to give up the tragedy would have been to give up the story *Die drei gerechten Kammacher*, which dates from the early period, and which some would count as tragic, is not tragic because the bearers of the action do not possess the qualities of tragic persons.

¹ *Werke*, VIII, 358.

² Cf. Fr. Jodl, *Ludwig Feuerbach*, 1904.

Moreover, there are various statements of Keller's which substantiate the fact that he grew more and more averse to tragedy with the years. I will take time to quote just one of them. "Allein Meyer hat eine Schwäche für solche einzelne Brutalitäten und Totschläge," (the work under discussion is *Jürg Jenatsch*) "Wenn er so was hört oder liest, so sagt er: vortrefflich! So hat jeder seinen Zopf!"³

I will consider that this point is well enough established, since Bächtold has touched upon it, also, and because it is important only for what lies back of it, namely, his changed view of life, as may be shown as follows:

In Keller's mature view of life there was no place for the future world, either of the Christians, or of the panlogists; nor for pessimism, so prominent in the philosophy and in the theory of tragedy of the period; nor was there any place for fatalistic polytheism nor, incidentally, for the hot-house optimism of such a man as Nietzsche, which may explain Keller's refusal of Nietzschean philosophy. Incidentally I may say that Keller's views on the drama may best be read up in Preitz,⁴ although this work is devoid of any philosophical interpretation of the views expressed.

In the first place we know that Keller considered drama the highest form of poetic art. We know also that Keller was no dramatist, but that is not because he had not well-defined views of tragedy but because of the nature of his poetic faculty. I need here to touch only on the salient points and I may add that most of these views were expressed in letters to Hermann Hettner, who considered them significant enough to embody them almost verbally into his work *Das moderne Drama*, Braunschweig, 1852.

As an esthetic means Keller saw no objection to the *fatum* if it did not interfere with clearness and simplicity, Keller's first prerequisites. And thus, while he does not agree with those who, like Herder, thought fate a necessary accessory in the motivation of good tragedy, nor with the modern pessimists who practically approximate this position, he does praise the French classicists who used the *fatum* as a motif "um ihre kindliche und doch so männliche Naivetät und hauptsächlich um ihre reine Tragik".⁵ The

³ A. Köster, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Theodor Storm und Gottfried Keller*, Berlin, 1909, p. 194.

⁴ *Kellers dramatische Bestrebungen*. Marburg, 1909.

⁵ Bächtold, *Gottfried Kellers Leben*, Berlin, 1895, II, 124.

meaning is clear: the French—he is thinking here especially of Racine—used the *fatum* as a motive but with naivete of mind and clearness of style, and their world is as little troubled by brooding pessimistic theories of fate as was the fair age of Grecian tragedy. And when Keller condemns the predominant use of the *fatum*, as he does, he is thinking of contemporaries who had abused the fatalistic motive, and especially of certain heavy-footed pessimists who were, in Keller's generation, construing a new *fatum* which was far more depressing than the Grecian *fatum* ever thought of being.

We must pause here to remark on the legitimacy of reading a philosophical significance into tragedy at all. Tragedy has generally been considered by the critics a purely esthetic form, and while it might reflect *Weltanschauung*, it should do so only incidentally. But in more recent literature and criticism, *Weltanschauung* has played an important part in tragedy, and the theory of tragedy, and authors and critics have come to claim philosophical significance for the tragedy. As representatives of this view we may instance Schopenhauer, Wagner, and Nietzsche. But even Hebbel comes very close to this view. As to his theory of the drama it is a well-known fact that Hebbel bases on, or coincides with, Solger and Hegel. Now Solger starts from certain ideas of Schelling's in his analysis of tragedy. A passage containing the idea in point is as follows:

“Das Individuum muss Mittel, die Gattung Zweck der Natur erscheinen, das Individuelle untergehen und die Gattung bleiben, wenn es wahr ist, dass die einzelnen Produkte in der Natur als misslungene Versuche das Absolute darzustellen, angesehen werden müssen.”^a

Now this idea that the individual, if necessary, must be sacrificed to the genus is found in Solger, and, later, in Hebbel's dramatic theory, and, as is well known, has been perpetuated in the writings of Schopenhauer. This idea with an admixture of the irrationalism of Schelling's later years forms the basis of Schopenhauer's pessimism. Now we find both these trains of thought entering into Hebbel's theory, for the doctrine of *innere Freiheit bei äusserer Notwendigkeit* is evident enough in Hebbel, and just as Schelling finally floats over into the mysticism and theosophy

^a *Werke*, Part I, Vol. III, p. 51.

of Jacob Böhme, and locates the irrational in the Absolute itself: (Out of the absolute, out of the interaction of the *Urtrieb* and reflection (*reflektierender Verstand*) the world is born) so Hebbel calls this *Weltwerdung Gottes*, "*Gottes Sündenfall*." And thus we arrive at the heart of his theory that evil is situated in the *Weltgrund* itself and the greatest misfortune is to be born. Thus we find, not one or several dramas, but his theory of the drama as well, built upon his view of the world and standing or falling with the acceptance, at least for the time being, of this view by the auditor. I know very well that Hebbel never formulated the proposition in so many words but that is what his acceptance of Hegel's philosophical theory really signifies.

In Schopenhauer and Richard Wagner there comes the outspoken doctrine of the *tragische Weltanschauung* which in the case of Schopenhauer ends in a return to oriental mysticism (*Nirwana*), but in Wagner takes on the form of *Gegenwartspessimismus* with *Zukunftsoptimismus*. In Nietzsche this fatalistic view finally ends also in a return to mysticism, in the doctrine of *die ewige Wiederkehr*.

Among recent writers Richard Dehmel is on the other side of the question, but he also holds that the drama has a philosophical significance. However, he, as an optimist, or a meliorist, thinks that our age has overcome tragedy, in as far as this represents the *tragische Weltanschauung*.⁷

From the ranks of the critics again we will quote only one, Ernst Lahnstein, who writes: "Das Problem der Tragik ist seinem Wesen nach keine ästhetische, sondern eine Menschheitsfrage. Der Dichter, der im Leben, wie in der Kunst, mit ihm ringt, ist hier—wenn irgend wo—Representant der Menschheit."⁸

And thus we may say that in spite of the old theory that the drama is purely an esthetic form, it has been, and is being, used with a philosophical significance. As a result there has grown up a feeling, as shown in the case of Dehmel, that certain critics and authors have used tragedy to promulgate pessimistic views. This very feeling was shared by Keller in his day.⁹ And we think he was right, for the doctrine of *Zukunftsoptimismus* or that other of

⁷ R. Dehmel, *Gesammelte Werke*, Berlin, 1909. Vol. 9.

⁸ *Das Problem der Tragik in Hebbels Frühzeit*. Berlin, 1909, p. vi.

⁹ Cf. Bächtold 2, III.

die ewige Wiederkehr is too abstract for the average auditor to grasp. He sees and hears only the pessimism of the *now*.

As to the dramatists themselves, their attitude towards the problem of tragedy may be formulated thus: There are two camps among tragedy writers in modern times. The one has taken the question from the metaphysical side, that is, they have undertaken and are undertaking to probe into the metaphysics of the great problem of the universe. Is this problem soluble? It appears not. In spite of all the tragedies of this sort, the problem of the presence of evil in the *Weltgrund* (which is really the basal question in the problem) is just as enigmatic and as far from solution as it was in Greece, or in Eden for that matter. All that these metaphysical reflections have done, and apparently can do, is, cynically at times, at times stupidly, to bring us face to face with the old sphynx, the dull and sodden and disheartening fact, that we cannot understand the dualism in our universe.

And if you say to me that my conception of this school is shallow, and that their pessimism is really idealism, because, thru the Hegelian thesis-antithesis-synthesis theory, out of the present order of the world there is to come a new order, thru development, and that your pessimist is working at this, then I ask whether humanity can understand such abstruse gospel, and, moreover, whether such abstruse ideas can be represented productively on the stage anyway? I know also that a sort of fierce, primitive conception of religion and history resides in the school of Hebbel and Nietzsche, which may find its full justification in German history of the last 300 years, but I ask: is this the view generally held by Germans? May not salvation be achieved equally thru the idealism of the present age in a new humanism which grows out of this dark northern fatalistic view which has hung like a pall over northern Europe for a generation and more?

The other school has left the metaphysical speculations to the philosophers and has substituted therefor psychological grounds in the philosophical motivation of tragedy. This type prefers to work at problems which can be solved. Their domain is the psychological problem of action and reaction, of cause and effect. And here you recognize at once that we stand upon the ground of modern science. Now we know very well that modern science also rests upon hypotheses, but what scientist bothers about that? Just so the tragic poet need not bother about it. He is, according to his

conception of art, either striving primarily for beauty, or working at problems. And as far as he is working at social and psychological problems he stands upon the ground of modern science. The problems of social action and reaction, cause and effect, can be solved sufficiently accurately for the present, and with the progress of science there lie greater possibilities here. Thus the tragic poet has here the possibility of contributing not only to the esthetic pleasure but to the enlightenment and the betterment of the race.

Keller dislikes a predominant use of chance as a tragic motive, first, because of his desire for clearness and simplicity, and furthermore because its predominant use overemphasizes its place in the government of the world. The question might be formulated thus: Is depending mainly upon chance, in any undertaking, a good progressive policy?

As to the question of tragic guilt, Keller stands half-way between the two schools, one of which never construes tragic guilt for the hero, while the other always does. In this he follows the popular feeling, which, no doubt, has good ground: namely, that the guiltless tragic hero is not the only kind to be found in the world. Take, for instance, Prinz Friedrich von Homburg as a representative of the guilty hero, and on the other side Cyrano de Bergerac, or Dietrich von Bern. And, incidentally, I should like to mention the latter as an example of Christian plot which makes crushing tragedy, since it is claimed that no real tragedy is possible with the Christian view of the world. This is asserted because there is no tragedy for the Christian since the happiness of the Christian heaven awaits him. But how about your *Zukunftsoptimisten*; are they not also hoping for salvation some time, somewhere?

Keller also has examples of tragedy in which no tragic guilt is construed for the tragic persons, namely, in *Romeo und Julia*, and *Regina*. But here there is nothing of the pessimistic, fatalistic. Here we have a psychological tragedy which follows in the steps of Charles Darwin rather than in those of Hegel-Schopenhauer-Nietzsche, for here the guilt lies in the one case with the parents of the tragic persons, in the other with the environment or family connection (*Familienzusammengehörigkeit*).

We come to our conclusion regarding Keller's view of tragedy. In the first place we may say that he, like Goethe, was averse to tragedy, "und hat tragische Situationen lieber vermieden als aufgesucht." Moreover, Keller could not go very far with Hegel-

Solger-Hebbel for the reason that panlogism is not to his way of thinking, and merely asserting his freedom of will against fate and by a free act of the will giving up existence does not avail Keller anything. Nor could he go very far with the Schopenhauer-Nietzsche idea of *tragische Weltanschauung* for the very obvious reason that Keller is a meliorist, and again, the pessimistic ferment of this school availed him nothing, since his art is not for art's sake but for humanity's sake, and he felt that their pessimism was not a progressive human force. That is, as we saw, also Dehmel's attitude, in the work quoted. In its stead Keller substituted "die Hingabe an das rein Menschliche," an active functioning realism which, since it works at present-day tasks, amounts to meliorism, just as Richard Wagner had learned this attitude from Feuerbach, before he finally adopted Schopenhauer as his guide.

CHARLES H. HANDSCHIN.

Miami University.

TWO OTHERWORLD STORIES

Most scholars who have had occasion to deal with the Celtic otherworld story either uphold or assume its independent and unique character.¹ But this position has not passed without challenge: it has been implied, for example, that the Teutonic and especially the Oriental conceptions of the otherworld are almost indistinguishable from the Celtic.² The purpose of this study is to determine whether the early Celtic otherworld story can be paralleled by otherworld story from one body of Oriental literature—the *Arabian Nights*.

After carefully searching through the ten volumes of *The Thousand and One Nights* translated by Sir Richard F. Burton,³

¹ See, for instance, G. L. Kittredge, "Sir Orfeo," *American Journal of Philology*, VII, 188-197; Alfred Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, 230-234; W. H. Schofield, "The Lays of Graelent and Lanval," *P. M. L. A.*, xv, 165-171; A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain*, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, VIII.

² See Rose Jeffries Peebles, *The Legend of Longinus*, Bryn Mawr College Monographs, IX, 173.

³ Published by the Kamashastra Society, Benares, 1885. This study does not include the *Supplementary Nights*.

I have found fifteen⁴ or more stories of the adventure of mortals in a land of otherworld beings. These otherworld stories show, for the most part, a marked difference from the earliest known Celtic stories of that genre. Since space does not permit the detailed consideration of all fifteen Arabic stories, I have selected for comparison with Celtic otherworld story only the two stories which show most resemblance to the Celtic, both of which are summarized below.⁵

I. An unfortunate king chances upon a palace occupied by ten young men and an old man, all blind in one eye and sorrowful. In spite of their repeated warnings, the king insists on knowing the cause of their sorrow until they put him in the way of learning what they had experienced by sewing him up in a ram's skin. Then a large bird picks him up and flies with him to a mountain. After he releases himself from the skin and walks for half a day, he comes to a splendid palace plated with red gold. At the palace he is welcomed by forty most beautiful damsels, who become his mistresses and entertain him royally until the beginning of the new year, when they all fly away for an annual visit of forty days to their parents, leaving him instructions that he might enter all of the forty chambers of the palace save one. In one of the rooms (only five are described) he finds a garden with trees and birds singing "their melodies hymning the One, the Almighty in sweetest litanies." But the king is not satisfied with entering only thirty-nine rooms, and finally he enters the forbidden chamber. He finds there a horse, which he mounts and starts with a whip. The horse flies through the air to the roof of the palace

⁴ These stories are found in Burton's translation: I, 151 ff.; IV, 172 ff.; V, 317 ff., V, 365 ff.; VI, 146 ff., VI, 160 ff.; VII, 34 ff., VII, 79 ff., VII, 84 ff., VII, 280 ff., VII, 363 ff.; VIII, 20 ff., VIII, 67 ff.; IX, 179 ff., IX, 330 ff. It is but natural that there should be a considerable number of stories, probably fifteen or twenty, which might be classified as near-otherworld stories. These doubtful cases I have thought best not to consider, especially since they offer no striking parallel to the early Celtic otherworld story.

⁵ The first story is from *The Third Kalendar's Tale*, a sub-story of *The Porter and the Three Ladies of Baghdad*, Burton, I, 151-160; the second is from *The Man Who Never Laughed during the Rest of His Days*, a sub-story of *The Craft and Malice of Women*, Burton, VI, 160-166. Two other stories (Burton, VII, 280 ff.; IX, 179 ff.) are interesting in that they, like some Celtic stories, place the otherworld within the sea. One of these stories (IX, 179 ff.) has what might be called a Land of Women. Both of these, however, are in other respects so different from the Celtic that a further comparison is not called for. The Land of Women idea appears again in two other stories (Burton, VIII, 20 ff., 67 ff.) besides the two summarized in this article; but it should be noted that only in the two summarized stories is the Land of Women, like the Celtic, thought of as a place of sensuous delight.

of the one-eyed men, shakes him off, and leaves him after gouging out one of his eyes.

II. A worthless young man who has squandered his inheritance is employed by a company of eleven constantly lamenting old men on condition that he ask nothing about the cause of their sorrow. When he has filled his post for twelve years and the last old man is on his death-bed, the youth insists on knowing the cause of his sorrow. Reluctantly the old man tells him to enter a certain door in the building, if he is determined to know the cause of the old men's lamentations. The youth enters the door indicated and finds a narrow passage which leads him, after a walk of three hours, to a strange seashore, where he is picked up by a large eagle and carried to an island in the midst of the ocean. After a wait of a few days, he observes approaching a ship built of ebony and ivory, inlaid with gold, and sailed by ten beautiful damsels. They land, hail him as King and Bridegroom, and set sail with him. Before long they come to a land filled with troops and go up in state to the capital city, near which are "gardens and trees and streams and blooms and birds chanting the praises of Allah the One, the Victorious." All the troops are women. The king of the country proves to be a beautiful woman in disguise and marries the young man. Men are mentioned as being workmen and artisans in the country, but they do not figure in the story. The young man lives happily with his mistress seven years until he is led by his curiosity to open a forbidden door, behind which he finds the eagle which had formerly transported him from the seashore to the island. Immediately the eagle picks him up and carries him back to the seashore where the eagle had first appeared. After having been warned by a voice that his good fortune was not to return, the young man wanders sorrowfully back to the house where he had served the twelve old men.⁶

In the two stories just summarized the salient features might be outlined thus: (1) The mortal is impelled by curiosity and chances upon the otherworld.⁷ (2) The essential method of reaching the

⁶ Professor H. S. V. Jones, "*The Cléomadès and Related Folk Tales*," *P. M. L. A.*, XXIII, 580-581, summarizes the first of these stories and points out that it is an otherworld tale. While the otherworld characteristics are not so marked in these two Arabic stories as they are in most of the fifteen, I am using these stories, as I have indicated above, because they are the most favorable to the hypothesis that the Arabic otherworld story closely resembles the Celtic.

⁷ In both Arabic stories the mortal seems to be expected in the otherworld. In the first story the king is even told by the forty damsels: "This whole month have we been expecting thee." Could it have been that in an earlier form these stories, like the Celtic, represented the otherworld mistress as enamored of the mortal and summoning him to the otherworld? Such a supposition is not borne out by the other Fairy Mistress stories in *The Thousand and One Nights*, for in every case the mortal is represented as taking the initiative. Cf. Burton, VII, 280 ff.; VIII, 67 ff., etc.

otherworld is by an aerial journey⁸—for although the mortal in the second story goes a part of the journey by boat, the method of his return suggests that the boat is not an essential feature. (3) The otherworld has certain characteristics: (a) it contains trees and singing birds engaged in a religious service; (b) it is a Land of Women. (4) The otherworld mistress places a taboo on the mortal. (5) As a result of the broken taboo, the mortal does not remain permanently in the otherworld.

Two early Celtic otherworld stories which are often referred to as representative of the early Celtic conception of the otherworld, and which seem to me to have as much resemblance to the Arabic otherworld stories as any, are the Old Irish *Imram Brain maic Febail* and *Echtra Condla Chaim*.⁹ These typical Celtic otherworld stories may be outlined in their main features as follows: (1) The mortal goes to the otherworld on a definite invitation from the Fairy Mistress. (2) He goes over the sea in a boat. (3) The otherworld has certain characteristics: (a) it contains trees and singing birds engaged in a religious service (*Brain*); (b) it is a Land of Women; (c) it is especially marked by its magic food, the supernatural lapse of time (*Brain*), and the eternal youthfulness of its inhabitants. (4) The Fairy Mistress places a taboo on the mortal (*Brain*). (5) The mortal remains finally in the otherworld.

While the outlines above might have been carried out at greater length, I have omitted no detail that would go to show a similarity between the Arabic and Celtic otherworld stories. As the outlines stand, parallels appear only in the third and fourth divisions. But the parallel in the fourth becomes less evident on close examination. In the Arabic, the taboo seems to be a kind of test for the fortunate mortal; in the Irish, the taboo is against

⁸ Professor H. S. V. Jones (572-581) discusses the frequent use of the aerial journey in Oriental story and its use as a method of reaching the otherworld. I have found that two-thirds of the otherworld stories from *The Nights* employ a journey through the air as a means of communication between this world and the otherworld. So far as I know, the aerial journey is used in Celtic otherworld story only in *The Courtship of Etain* (A. H. Leahy, *Heroic Romances of Ireland*, I, 32).

⁹ The first of these stories is edited and translated by Kuno Meyer, *The Voyage of Bran*, I, 1-35; the second is edited by Ernst Windisch, *Kurzgefasste irische Grammatik*, 118-120. In outlining the stories I have used translations by Meyer, l. c., and H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *L'Épopée Celtique*, I, 385-390.

a different thing entirely—against touching land upon returning from the other world—and seems to be given, not as a test for the mortal, but as a precaution necessitated by the fact that the mortal has remained in the otherworld long past the normal period of his life.

The parallels in otherworld characteristics are probably a little more striking. Both Arabic and Celtic otherworld have trees and singing birds engaged in a religious service. One difference might be noticed in the fact that the birds and trees of the Arabic are in no way supernatural, or different from the birds and trees frequently described as existing in the ordinary Oriental garden,¹⁰ while in the Irish, the never-decaying trees, if not the birds, certainly have a supernatural touch.¹¹ The most striking parallel of all lies in the fact that the different stories contain what is called, or what might be called, a Land of Women.

But the parallels between the otherworld stories from *The Thousand and One Nights* and from early Celtic literature, even in the case of the two Arabic stories most favorable to the hypothesis that the Arabic otherworld story closely resembles the Celtic, are distinctly less noticeable than the contrasts. In the otherworld stories from *The Nights* the mortal, not the Fairy Mistress, takes the initiative; the mortal reaches the otherworld after an aerial journey; he never finds in the otherworld the magic food or drink, eternal youth, or the supernatural lapse of time so common to the early Celtic tales; and he never goes to live permanently in the otherworld.¹² It is evident, then, that the Oriental otherworld story, as we have it in *The Thousand and One Nights*, does not furnish, even in the examples which most resemble the Celtic, a satisfactory parallel to the early Celtic stories of the journey to the otherworld.

JOHN C. HODGES.

Harvard University.

¹⁰ See, for example, Burton, II, 23; VI, 189; VII, 311.

¹¹ For a discussion of singing birds, etc., in the Celtic otherworld, see A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain*, Harvard Studies and Notes, VIII, 82-94. Singing birds are described in most of the Arabic otherworld stories. In a number of cases they are engaged in a religious service. Cf. Burton, VII, 42; VIII, 29, 30.

¹² These statements apply to all fifteen stories, except that the aerial journey does not appear in four or five.

A FRAGMENT OF A LORD MAYOR'S PAGEANT

There is an interesting fragment in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. B. 15.39 (James's *Catalogue*, No. 181, Part III)¹ which appears to be an address before a Lord Mayor. The verses stand on the last leaf of a fifteenth century vellum manuscript and, according to Dr. James, are written in a hand of the early sixteenth century. Three of the seven-line stanzas occupy one page and the fourth is written on the upper half of the following page, the lower half being left blank. A transcript of the poem follows:

By hym that All dothe i[
imbrasse²
 And nothing his person m[
may compasse²

In the ende of yemps whan Phebus had serchid
 Envyrour the world and stode yn Aquarye
 And saturne finally his wrech hath wrechyd
 My bemys y spred yn compas youre emysperie
 Remembryng youre Iugementis and faythfull con[
conspiracy³
 3e haue concluded youre citee to polysshe
 Eschewyng Ryot and vertue to norysshe.

I certefie you that Tytane And Neptune
 In their confedracy with water and fyre
 In March shall mete as couenable sesonne
 To produce the ffecte of youre noble desire
 A spice that of all spice hathe empyre
 And sauerythe all things erthly and divyne
 Which they shall multiplye unto your state and tyme
 Whiche spice was cast yn the water of Amarak
 And sesond the waters that were absinthius
 Of this same spice had salamon A smak
 Whane he 3afe Iugement betwene women viceus
 Thys same spice the profite heliseus
 Vsed to voided all barenesse
 And by this same spyce ys swagyd all oure distress[

¹ My attention was called to this manuscript by Professor Carleton Brown.

² These words were cut out in trimming the pages and have been interlined by a later hand.

³ This word is given by James as *gryerary*.

Now to succede youre tyme in vertu
 I haue sent from oure celestiall trone
 The seruantis of venus and mars to sewe you
 That loue ner drede blemyssh not youre dome
 But all Odius Rancoure be rasyd from you sone
 To youre honowre worship and ryall mageste
 That 3e present duryng youre mayralte.

Vnto the most noble Senature wt all diligens
 Protector of the comyn welle in oure absens.⁴

The phrase "youre mayralte," in the last line of the third stanza, shows that the poem was delivered before a Lord Mayor. Some clue to the occasion for which these verses were composed appears to be afforded in the references to that "spice which of all spice hath the empyre." Accordingly, the elucidation of these references may be made the starting point of our inquiry. The spice which "the profite heliseus used to void all bareness" was unquestionably salt: "At ille ait: Afferte mihi vas novum, et mitte in illud sal. Quod cum attulissent, egressus ad fontem aquarum, misit in illum sal, et ait: Haec dicit Dominus: Sanavi aquas has, et non erit ultra in eis mors, neque sterilitas." (*IV Reg.* II, 20-21). Again, the statement that Solomon had "of this same spice. . . . A smak whane he jafe Iugement betwene wemen viceus" refers to salt as the symbol of wisdom. This symbolic significance of salt is found in the New Testament: "Sermo vester semper in gratia sale sit conditus, ut sciatis, quomodo oporteat vos unicuique respondere." (*Col.* IV, 6). The spice in these two references is undoubtedly salt.⁵ A difficulty is presented, on the other hand, by the spice which "was cast yn the water of Amarak." Moses threw into the bitter waters of Mara, not salt, but "lignum": "At ille clamavit ad Dominum, qui ostendit ei lignum; quod cum misisset in aquas, in dulcedinem versae sunt." (*Exodus* XV, 25). Jewish tradition affirms that "man turns bitter to sweet by the agency of some sweet stuff, but God transformed the bitter water [of Mara] through the bitter laurel tree."⁶ Comestor apparently refers to

⁴These two lines are copied just below in a hand of the seventeenth century.

⁵I am indebted to Professor Brown for this suggestion and for assistance in finding the references to salt.

⁶L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Tr. by Paul Radin, 1911), Vol. III, p. 39.

this legend when he says, "amarum additum amaro, dulcedinem operatum est."⁷ Now if by bitter water was meant salt water, as one commentator suggests,⁸ then, according to the principle *similia similibus curantur*, it would be natural to throw salt into the water to sweeten it. But it is not likely that the author of our poem had the original story before him, and it may be that the use of salt in the other two cases suggested to him the introduction of it in the story of the waters of Mara. So while this allusion is not substantiated by the Biblical story there is little doubt that it refers, like the others, to salt.

This interpretation appears to receive further confirmation from the statement in the last line of the third stanza: "by this same spice is swagd all our distress." These words certainly suggest that the spice in question has some definite Christian significance, and the reference is readily understood when one remembers the importance of salt in the ritual of the early church. The *Benedictio Salis* is found today in many services of the Roman Church: the dedication of a church,⁹ the mass for the living and the dead,¹⁰ the Baptismal service,¹¹ and the preparation of holy water before mass.¹² The formula for these blessings of salt goes back ultimately to the Gregorian Sacramentary of the ninth century.¹³

The encomium of salt which runs through this poem is easily understood if we suppose that the mayor to whom it was addressed was a member of the Company of Salters. This will help us toward establishing the occasion of the poem since we may now limit ourselves to those mayors who were members of the Salters' Company. But the Salters did not often have a mayor chosen from their number, in fact it was a mere accident that placed them among the Twelve Livery Companies¹⁴ from whom it was the custom to select the mayor. According to Stowe there were four

⁷ *Historia Scholastica*, Exodus Cap. XXXII (*Patrologia*, Vol. 198, col. 1699).

⁸ Lange, *Commentary on Exodus* (Tr. by C. M. Mead, 1876, p. 60)

⁹ J. Gage, *Archaeologia*, Vol. XXV, pp. 235-274.

¹⁰ *York Breviary*, 1883, Vol. II, column 45 (Surtees Society, Vol. LXXV).

¹¹ Bromyard, *Summa Praedicatorum*, 1586, Vol. I, p. 293^a, 365^a.

¹² *Salisbury Processions and Ceremonies* (ed. Chr. Wordsworth, 1901), pp. 18, 19, 73.

¹³ *Gregorian Sacramentary* (Henry Bradshaw Soc. Vol. 49, 1915, pp. 53, 159, 219).

¹⁴ G. Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 1908, p. 55.

Salter Mayors during the sixteenth century: Sir Thomas Pargitor, 1530; John Cootes, 1542; Sir Ambrose Nicholas, 1575; Sir W. Web, 1592.¹⁵ Of these, however, the last two are evidently too late for our purpose, since the copy of these verses in the Trinity College manuscript is written in a hand of the early sixteenth century. Accordingly, in determining the date of the pageant for which this poem was composed, our choice lies between 1530-1 and 1542-3.

The fact that the verses are addressed to the "Protector of the comyn welle" might at first suggest a date subsequent to 1547, the year in which Somerset assumed the title of Protector. But it is to be noted: (1) that Somerset did not style himself Protector of the Commonwealth, (2) that the person thus addressed is more definitely described in the phrase "your mayralte," (3) that the phrases employed are highly vague and rhetorical, as indeed might be expected in a message proceeding from Apollo or some other mythological divinity. Probably, therefore, by "the most noble Senature . . . Protector of the comyn welle" we are to understand merely the Lord Mayor, guardian of the city and vicegerent under the celestial ruler who is represented as speaking.

Although these verses were designed for some festival in honor of a Lord Mayor, the reference which they contain to the end of winter and approach of spring makes it impossible to connect them with the pageant at the mayor's inauguration, since this took place on the twenty-ninth of October. However, in the sixteenth century pageants were not confined to the Lord Mayor's day; they were held on every grand occasion: "to meet the king or his guests on their entry into the city from Westminster or from abroad,"¹⁶ or to celebrate a victory. Hall describes many of these pageants in his *Chronicle*, but he makes no mention of any occurring during the month of March in either 1531 or 1542. Accordingly, we are left entirely without evidence as to the particular

¹⁵ *Survey of London*, new edition by C. C. Kingsford, 1908, II, 178. In another place Stowe mentions the monument of "Sir Richard Chawry, Saltar, Mayor 1509" (I, 346), from which it might be supposed that there was a fifth Salter mayor in the 16th century. But Chawry served as Mayor in 1494, and 1509 is the year of his death, as is confirmed by the record of his will (Cf. *Calendar of Wills, Count of Hustings, London*, 1288-1688, Ed. R. R. Sharpe, 1890, p. 614.)

¹⁶ W. C. Hazlitt, *The Livery Companies of London*, 1892, p. 46.

occasion for which these verses were composed, although possibly this information might be supplied by examining the records of the Salters' Company.¹⁷

In conclusion, the relation of this fragment to other records of the Lord Mayor's pageants may be noted briefly, though few descriptions of these early pageants have survived. Hall describes an exhibition which the Lord Mayor's Company was called upon to make in 1533 to celebrate Anne Boleyn's journey from Greenwich to Westminster, "as they used to dooe when the Maior is presented at Westminster on the morowe after Symon and Iude" (p. 789). In the records of the Ironmongers for 1566 there is given the first detailed account of a regular Lord Mayor's Show.¹⁸ But the first text of a pageant, "that has been handed down belongs to the mayoralty of Sir Thomas Rowe merchant Tailor (1568) and consists of a dozen verses spoken by four boys."¹⁹ "The Device of the Pageant borne before Woolstone Dixi, Lord Maior of the Citie of London," 1585, by George Peele, gives for the first time the speeches of the characters in the pageant.²⁰ Therefore, the fragment before us is a new and early record of a Lord Mayor's pageant.

This investigation, then, establishes three things in regard to this sixteenth century poem: it is a part of a pageant presented before a Salter Mayor of London, either Sir Thomas Pargitor 1530, or Sir John Cootes 1542; it is another record of the pageants of the Salter Company to be added to that of 1591, and it is an earlier text than that of 1568 hitherto considered the earliest known text of a Lord Mayor's pageant.

ELIZABETH D. ADAMS.

Bryn Mawr College.

¹⁷ The only history of the Company of Salters that has been written is that by Thomas Gillespie, "compiled from various authors by an old Salter" (London, 1827). I have been unable to discover a copy of this book in this country. However, it is a brief account and would probably afford little information relating to our present inquiry.

¹⁸ W. Herbert, *History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London*, 1837, Vol. I, p. 199.

¹⁹ G. Unwin, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

²⁰ F. W. Fairholt, *Lord Mayors' Pageants*. (Percy Soc., Vol. x.) 1843, p. 24.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES

1. Germ. **and-drēdan* 'dred' is, according to Torp, *Nord. Tid.* xvi, 146 f. and Fick III⁴, 102, from **and-hrēdan*: ON. *hrēða*, 'erschrecken.' If that were so, we might expect to find some trace of W. Germ. **hrādan*, 'dred' at least in compounds without *and-*, but no **hrādan* has come down to us. On the other hand we have evidence for W. Germ. **drādan*, 'dred, fear' in OE. *on-*, *ā-drædan*, 'fear, dred,' *of-drædd*, 'afraid,' OS. *an-drādan*, 'fürchten,' OHG. *in-trātan*, id. These are from a root **dhrēdh-*, 'be startled, fear,' with which compare **dhrōdh-* in Gr. *θρώσσει · φοβέεται* ('fears'), *ἔθρωσεν · ἐκινέτω* (Aesch.).

2. NHG. *lugen*, 'spähend schauen,' OHG. *luogēn* is regarded as of doubtful origin in Kluge and in Weigand. An old connection, referred to in Kluge, adopted by Zupitza, *Germ. Gutt.* 209, and approved by Brugmann, *Gdr. der vgl. Gram.*², II, 3, p. 341, is with Skt. *lakṣ*, 'bemerken.'

Of this combination one is constrained to say:

Weshalb in die Weite schweifen, wenn das Gute liegt so nah?
For *lugen* is plainly related to *liegen*, as Schade, *Ad. Wb.*², 578, surmises. OHG. *luogēn* is not simply influenced by (cf. Fick III⁴, 370) but derived from *luog*, *luoga*, 'Lagerhöhle des Wildes, Höhle, Schlupfwinkel, Versteck': OE. *lōg*, 'place,' *lōgian*, 'place; portion out, arrange,' MDu. *loech*, 'place; dwelling; hole, dungeon,' *loegen*, 'place, arrange.'

OHG. *luogēn*, 'aus einem Verstecke hervorsehen,' belongs to *luog*, 'Versteck' just as OHG. *lāgēn*, *lāgōn* 'auflauern; nachstellen; wonach trachten' belongs to *lāga*, 'Lage; lauerndes Liegen,' and as Gr. *λοχάω*, 'lie in wait, watch, waylay' to *λόχος* 'ambush, a place for lying in wait, lurking-place, lair; a lying in wait.' For meaning compare Lat. *insidiar*, 'lie in ambush, lie in wait for, watch for': *insidiae*, 'ambush,' *insideo*, 'sit in or upon'; NHG. *lauern*, 'worauf heimlich aufpassen,' MHG. *lüren* 'lauern': **lūre*, 'Lauer, Hinterhalt.'

3. OS. *lōkoian*, 'blicken,' MDu. *loeken*, 'kijken, turen, gluren,' 'look, glower,' OE. *lōcian*, 'look, see,' with *tō*, *intō*, 'belong,' ME.

lōken, 'look keep, observe,' NE. *look*, probably belong to *lugen* with Germ. *k* from pre-Germ. *-ghn-*.

4. OHG. *mand(a)wāri*, 'mitis, mansuetus,' occurring *Tatian* 22, 9; 67, 9; 116, 3, is divided by Sievers *man-dwāri*, as if connected with OE. *gepwāre*, 'peaceful, gentle.' But in that case what is *man-*? I think it more probable that the word should be divided *mand-wāri*.

The first part is then from Germ. **manfa-*, 'mild, gentle' in OS. *māðmundi*, OHG. *mammunti*, 'sanftmütig, freundlich, mild,' perhaps related to Lat. *mānus* 'bonus,' *immānis*, 'fierce, wild, monstrous.'

The second part is from Germ. **wēria-*, 'agreeing, friendly' in ON. *várr*, 'freundlich, angenehm,' OHG. *miti-wāri*, 'sanft, mitis,' *ala-wāri*, 'freundlich, gütig,' Goth. *un-wērjan*, 'unwillig sein': OHG. *wāra*, 'foedus, pactum,' OE. *wær*, 'agreement, treaty, faith, friendship,' etc.

5. NE. *shilly-shally*, 'act in an irresolute or undecided manner, hesitate,' *adv.* 'in an irresolute or hesitating manner,' *sb.* 'indecision, irresolution, foolish trifling' is derived by secondary ablaut, after the analogy of such forms as *dilly-dally*, *filly-fally*, from *shally-shally* 'irresolutely.' For this the improbable explanation has been given that it is for *shall I? shall I?* It is rather a derivative of NE. dial. *shale*, 'walk crookedly or awkwardly; stagger; shamle; glide, slope, slant, move in a slanting direction,' whence *shallock*, 'idle about, slouch, move slowly, trailing the feet from laziness,' *sb.* 'an idle, dilatory, or gossiping habit.' The ultimate origin is OE. *sceolh* 'wry, oblique.'

6. NE. dial. *shilly-shally*, 'weak, delicate; foolish, empty-brained; poor, inferior' is a derivative of dial. *shill*, 'thin, poor,' ME. *schalowe*, 'thin, shallow,' NE. *shallow*, dial. *shall*, NHG. *schal*. In English these two groups have influenced each other in meaning.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

REVIEWS

A Practical Introduction to French. By L. H. ALEXANDER. New York: Oxford University Press, 1916.

A Complete French Course. By C. A. CHARDENAL. Revised and rewritten by Maro S. Brooks. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1916.

Dr. Alexander's elementary grammar is intended for the first and second years of high schools and for the first year in colleges, and is meant above all to be a practical book.

The distinctive features of the work are as follows: 1) The nomenclature suggested by the Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature is used exclusively, and an outline of it is printed on pages xvii-xxi. 2) The essential facts of French pronunciation are given graded treatment in the body of the book. The phonetic symbols and the transcription of the French words in the first seven lessons are found in the Appendix, and all the words in the French-English vocabulary at the end of the book are also presented phonetically. 3) Within the 42 lessons the fundamental facts of French grammar are taken up twice. In the second part (18 lessons) the commoner irregular verbs are studied, and the exercises are based on three French stories (*La Chapelle blanche* of Jules Lemaitre, *Les Petits pâtés* of Alphonse Daudet, and *L'Enlèvement de la redoute* of Prosper Mérimée). In addition, there is a review of the grammatical facts contained in the first part (24 lessons), each grammatical topic being presented as a unit.

The French in the examples is generally good, a state of things not too common to merit mention. The exercises are satisfactory; they are not of the kind found in the older grammars for beginners, and they do illustrate the grammatical facts they are supposed to exemplify. A feature worthy of praise is the division into two parts which makes possible a more satisfactory review than is the case when the students simply have to read again familiar rules. It might be said that the too summary reference to topics treated in Part 1 has its inconvenience; the repetition of the important facts in the proper place in Part 2 would have eliminated troublesome turning of pages and made a thorough review more probable. The texts given in the second part will obviate one of the chief difficul-

ties encountered at this stage: the use of insufficiently annotated texts. In the simplest texts the student finds a good many forms of irregular verbs and other facts with which he is unfamiliar after five to six weeks of study; the notes to the selections and the irregular verbs taken up in this part will enable the average student to approach profitably a little later one of the texts available.

Mention should be made of the relatively large number of unnecessary abbreviations in the text, of the abrupt manner in which some paragraphs are begun, and also of the rather colloquial tone of some of the questions.

The lessons devoted to pronunciation are good. The addition of phonetic transcriptions in the lesson vocabularies might have been advantageous. The transcription of the French contained in the lessons on pronunciation is not uniformly satisfactory. See the following: p. 236: *wa-gō* (wagon), p. 237, last exercise: *lurd* (lourd), *fer* (chère), *fla:m* (flamme), p. 238, Lesson II, ex.: *far-ʒra* (chargera), *e fa* (les chats), p. 239, Lesson III: *pō:l* (Paul), *a-matō:r* (amateur), p. 241, Lesson V: *ā-fi-te-a:tr* (amphithéâtre), p. 242: *si ze-lēv* (six élèves), p. 243: *fwa-si* (choisi), *mar-fe* (marché) which is given as *mar-fe* in the vocabulary, p. 244: *fwa-si-se* (choisissez). Some of these are probably typographical errors.

Page 19: The statement that, in linking, "f = v: only in neuf heures (= nine hours, nine o'clock)" is incorrect or not clear enough; cf. the transcription of *neuf élèves* and *neuf hommes* on p. 242. Pp. 48-49: In the summary on the partitive nouns, it is stated that the definite article is not used after negations. It might be advisable to change to 'general negations.' P. 91: "N'as-tu pas rendu le livre?—Mais si, (je l'ai rendu)." The answer "Yes, I have (returned it)" is not quite strong enough. P. 116: Is it well to translate *mètre* by *yard*? P. 144: "Pouvez-vous nous y renseigner?" translated by "Can you give us any information?" is doubtful French. P. 147: *Renonçassiez* appears in black type in the Exercise, and there is no note about the fact that such forms are hardly ever used in the spoken language. P. 151: *Allassiez*. See preceding note. P. 167: The wording of the rule that most names of countries not forming a phrase like *les Etats-Unis* are feminine is not clear. It might give the student the impression that *le Portugal*, *le Japon*, *le Mexique*, *le Canada* are the only exceptions. P. 193: The note on "ne faisaient qu'en rire" reads: "*Se rire de* or *se moquer de* means *to laugh at, make sport of.*" As there is no

reflexive in the text, and as *rire de* has the same meaning as *se rire*, the pronoun ought to be put in parentheses or deleted. P. 207: *finestra* is given as the etymon of *fenêtre*. P. 217: Note 3 translates the axiom "non bis in idem" by "not twice in the same place." Cf. the captain's utterance, "Vous en voilà quitte pour la *journée*." The meaning in the language of courts is "not to try twice on the same charge," but it may be that Mérimée took it to mean here "in the same day." P. 222: Note 5 reads: "*Pas* is used with *pouvoir*, *savoir*, *cesser*, *oser* for emphasis." Add: 'in negations.'

VOCABULARY. FRENCH-ENGLISH. *au dela*: spell *au delà*. *divertir*: the *e* is open. *extase*: the *a* is close. *gout*: spell *goût*. *mouvoir*: correct in transcription to *a:r*. *murir*: spell *mûrir*. *présager*: the *s* is voiced. *présenter*: the *s* is voiced. *rigueur*: add *f.* after brackets. *se*: pronounced *s̃*. *singulièrement*: delete nasal mark on second *e* in the transcription. *temps*: in fifth line, correct to *fait-il?* *trente*: nasal mark on *a* in transcription.

ENGLISH-FRENCH. *alongside*: second line, read *à côté*. *disappear*: *disparaître*. *eagerly*: *avec empressement*. *group*: *groupe* is masculine. *once*: second line, read *sur-le-champ*. *over*: *par-dessus*. *play*: add *f.* after *pièce*. *protect*: "*être à couvert de*" means "to be protected." *receive*: read *recevoir*. *street-cars*: read *street-car*.¹

Mr. Brooks's revision of Chardenal's Complete French Course appears in its second edition, and the well-known grammar has been still further improved and modernized. In its new shape, it will doubtless continue to render good service and keep its place among the more usable works of its class. The book has been apparently totally reset, and in spite of some additions is about thirty pages shorter than the first edition. This thorough change of the typography has given excellent results. The general arrangement and method are the same; but a somewhat important change occurs in the exercises for translation, which have been rearranged so as to

¹The following minor errors of the printer have been found: p. 48, sec. 53: *grand'faim*; p. 51, sec. 57, 6 lines from bottom: *will*; p. 60, vocabulary: *irrégulier*; p. 72, sec. 71: *camarade*; p. 73, sec. 73: *après, grand'faim*; p. 79, 3 ll. fr. bot.: *père*; p. 82, l. 2: *été*, l. 5: *grand' peur*; p. 114, ex., l. 1: *se*; p. 117, *grand' soif*; p. 136: *desquels de ces rayons, etc.*; p. 143, 4 ll. fr. end of section 127: *time*; p. 171, l. 2: delete comma; p. 172, l. 8: *abricots*; p. 178, l. 5 in reading text: *Qu'est-ce que*; p. 227, ex., 4: *statues*; p. 252: *j'eusse rompu*; p. 252, sec. 197: *to sow*.

give more material for conversational work. In conformity with the DeVitis *Spanish Grammar* published by the same firm, a proverb or saying is given at the beginning of each lesson, and twenty illustrations of buildings or scenes in Paris and France add somewhat to the attractiveness of the book. The vocabularies are printed on the same pages, the French-English one at the top and the English-French at the bottom of the page. Six more selections have been added to the Selections for Reading. The statements (p. xvii) that "g before e, i and s has the sound of s in *pleasure*" and that (p. xxiii) "s and x have [in linking] the sound of x" ought to be corrected.²

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM.

Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*. Edited with Introduction, Appendices, Notes and Vocabulary by Frederick W. C. Lieder, Ph. D. New York, Oxford University Press, 1917.

Um etwaiger Missdeutung meiner Kritik vorzubeugen, muss ich zuvor konstatieren, dass ich selber soeben eine Ausgabe von Goethes *Hermann und Dorothea* abgeschlossen habe, die binnen kurzem erscheinen wird. Aus eben dem Grunde würde ich es vermieden haben, die vorliegende Arbeit zu besprechen, wenn es meine Absicht wäre, über diesselbe in herkömmlicher Weise zu berichten. Es liegt mir fern, für meine eigene Arbeit Platz machen zu wollen; denn die beiden stehen sich, wenigstens der Anlage nach, nicht im Wege. Noch habe ich irgend einen andern heimlichen Grund, auf die sorgfältige, fleissige Arbeit Lieders schlecht zu sprechen zu sein. Es handelt sich hier vielmehr um ein Prinzip, betreffs dessen man je nach individueller Stellungnahme mit mir übereinstimmen oder differieren wird.

Die XLIX + 315 Seiten des in Frage stehenden Buches sind in folgender Weise verteilt: 3 Seiten entfallen auf Biographie, 13 auf Entstehung, Hintergrund und literarhistorische Stellung des Werkes; dann folgt auf 10 Seiten eine metrische Abhandlung, auf

² The following misprints have been noted: xiv, l. 8: côté; xvii, l. 16: chimère; xx, 5 ll. from the bottom: exemple, exception; xxi, l. 11: inhabité; p. 250, l. 14: étaient; p. 250, l. 9 fr. bot.: parait; p. 250, l. 3 fr. bot.: continua-t-il; p. 251, l. 11 fr. bot.: écu; l. 3 fr. bot.: présente; p. 252, l. 5: montrez-m'en; p. 252, l. 16: maitre; p. 258, l. 8 fr. bot.: c'est.

4 Seiten eine Bestimmung des Gedichtes als episches Idyll oder idyllisches Epos; die übrigen 8½ Seiten der Einleitung sind der Wirkung und den Urteilen der Zeitgenossen und Nachfahren zugeteilt. Gut gedruckt und mit den Rambergischen Illustrationen geziert, schliesst sich die Dichtung selbst auf 110 Seiten an. Ein Anhang (1½ S.) gibt die wichtigsten Daten aus Goethes Leben in chronologischer Tafel, einer (1½ S.) die Elegie, einer (1½ S.) die Salzburgergeschichte; Anhang iv enthält aus Humboldts Untersuchung das Kapitel: Unterschied zwischen Idyll und Epopöe (3 S.), Anhang v August Wilhelm von Schlegels Besprechung in Verkürzung (12 S.), Anhang vi "Familiar Quotations from *Hermann und Dorothea*" (6 S.), Anhang vii "Selected Bibliography." Die Anmerkungen und ein Vokabular bilden den Beschluss.

Stichproben überzeugten mich von der Zuverlässigkeit, Sauberkeit, Gründlichkeit und Selbständigkeit der Textwiedergabe und des Apparates. Trotzdem glaube ich dass die Ausgabe keine andere Existenzberechtigung hat als die, der Oxford Serie (meine eigene Wertherausgabe darin verbietet mir ein Wort des Lobes) einen neuen Text zu erobern. Ist das aber ein Grund, den zahlreichen, zum Teil ausgezeichneten amerikanischen Ausgaben (ich denke besonders an die von Hatfield und Thomas) eine neue hinzuzufügen? Wie lange soll dieses Konkurrenzwettrennen der Verleger noch fortgesetzt werden?

Nur eine Einschränkung des Gesichtspunktes auf eine besondere Art der Behandlung oder Stufe des Unterrichts könnte eine neue Ausgabe rechtfertigen. Statt dessen wird das Absatzgebiet hier auf *die* Weise zu erweitern gesucht, dass die Anmerkungen für ganz elementare Zwecke mit ausführlichen Übersetzungen versehen werden, Einleitungen und Anhänge dagegen bewusst für vorgerückte, zum Teil sehr weit vorgerückte Studenten behandelt sind. Wenn Lieder für gewisse Schwierigkeiten (inverted order, use of subjunctive, omission of auxiliary verb, and word-order) in den Anmerkungen entsprechende Hilfe gibt, so ist das durchaus lobenswert, wenigstens in gewissen Grenzen. Wenn aber, weil manche Schüler das Werk bereits in der *Highschool* gelesen hätten, für diese ein Wiederlesen, selbst als Privatlektüre, ermöglicht werden solle durch Hinzufügung schwieriger Anhänge, so bedeutet das weiter nichts, als dass für *sie* eine Ausgabe wie die Vorliegende zu elementar ist.

Auch im Einzelnen zeigt sich dieser Widerspruch. Die Bio-

graphie beschränkt sich auf Daten. Den Anfänger führt sie nicht ein in den Geist des Goethischen Lebens, der Vorgerückte muss zu ausführlicherer Darstellung greifen. Ein paar Beispiele: "In Sesenheim, a quiet, dreamy hamlet near Strassburg, Goethe met Friederike Brion; she exerted an influence which is reflected in many of his poems and a number of his other works." Wer ist Friederike Brion? Wie konnte sie diesen Einfluss ausüben? Dem *High-school*-schüler würde wenigstens der Hinweis auf *das Heidenröslein* eine hoffentlich bekannte Grösse einsetzen, der vorgerückte Schüler dürfte schon etwas mehr verlangen.

"When we remember how many years Goethe was occupied with the composition of some of his works—*Faust*, *Wilhelm Meister*, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*—we must marvel at the spontaneity and rapidity of workmanship." Wer ist "we"? Der *Highschool*-schüler? Keines von diesen Werken (ausser das *Faustfragment*) ist zuvor erwähnt.

Was bedeutet die Zurückführung Dorotheas auf Lili, wenn es bei dem baren, biographischen Modellsuchen bleibt? Und dürfte dann der Anfänger nicht mindestens etwas mehr zu wissen verlangen als das "Lili Schoenemann, to whom he had once been engaged"? Für den, der mit Goethes Leben schon bekannt ist, kann doch diese Erklärung nicht gegeben sein. Warum sollten aber selbst für diesen Henriette von Egloffstein und Bäbe Schult-hess als Gewährsmänner genannt werden, wo doch sonst, der Ökonomie wegen, Namen wie die Frau von Steins, Christianes, selbst Schillers wegbleiben?

Kann man Homers Epen für den Durchschnittsschüler als wohl-bekannte Grössen voraussetzen? Warum dann Voss drei ganze Seiten gönnen? Sind aber selbst dem Studenten im *Seniorcollege* *Mahabharata* und *Ramayana* und *Kalevala* nicht höchstens Namen? (Aus Furcht, mich zu verraten, unterdrücke ich hier eine kleine boshafte Frage an den Herausgeber.) Mit gutem Gewissen kann ich dagegen dem Schüler verzeihen, nicht zu wissen, wer Vater Gleim ist, falls er nicht gerade einen "Survey course" gehabt hat. Und ob ihm die Diskussion über die Klassifizierung des Epos seine literarische Bedeutung viel näher bringen dürfte?

Ist es endlich nötig, bis Opitz und Spee (mit Doppel-e, bitte!) zurückzugehn, um Goethes Hexameter zu erklären? Sonst ist gerade dies Kapitel gut gelungen; aber der Anfänger wird kaum viel damit anfangen können. Beide Klassen von Schülern dürften

die Besprecher der Goethischen Dichtung, die in der *Neuen Nürnbergischen Gelehrten Zeitung* vom Dezember 1797 und in den *Neuesten Critischen Nachrichten* (Greifswald) vom Februar 1798 zu Worte kommen, nicht allzusehr begeistern, besonders wenn deren Weisheit von dieser Art ist: "a poem which in its class is an unsurpassable masterpiece." Und den Vergleich zwischen Vossens und Goethes Hexameter in der *Neuen Allgemeinen Deutschen Bibliothek* hat wohl die Nachwelt zu Gunsten Goethes ein für allemal entschieden. Auch die völlig willkürliche Blütenlese der spätern Kritiker würde niemanden davon überzeugen, dass *Hermann und Dorothea* "genuine artistic merit" hat, zumal wenn George Henry Lewes, "the eminent biographer of Goethe," darin als Hauptkronzeuge figuriert.

Soweit die Einleitung. Von den Anhängen ist die Chronologie, die Elegie, die Salzburgerepisode und die Schlegelsche Würdigung für vorgeschrittene Studenten berechtigt, das Kapitel aus Humboldt, dem gegenüber der Herausgeber selbst Worte wie "formidable" und "abstract" gebraucht, wäre schon eher zu beanstanden. Wie man aber eine Bibliographie "selected" nennen kann, deren Kenntnis einem Doktoranden alle Ehre machen würde, wenn er über Goethe gearbeitet hätte, und in der unter den "best known German accounts" auch Abeken, Bode, Döring, Erdmannsdörffer, Fischer, Förster, Goeschel, Keil, Kestner, Rosenkranz, Schaefer, Spiess, Thalmayr, Voss, Wolff und Zarncke erscheinen, geht über meine Begriffe; während andererseits unter den Essays über *Hermann und Dorothea* die wunderschöne Darstellung von Stapfer fehlt!

Noch ein Wort über Appendix VI, "familiar quotations." "Familiar" verdient doch wohl nur genannt zu werden, was sich wirklich im Volksmunde eingebürgert hat. Dazu zählen aber entschieden Verse wie z. B. die folgenden kaum:

Was die Neugier nicht tut! So rennt und läuft nun ein jeder,
Um den traurigen Zug der armen Vertriebnen zu sehen.

oder:

Fürwahr, ich habe genug am Erzählten.

oder:

Denn ein wanderndes Mädchen ist immer von schwankendem Rufe.

Bei manchen andern wird die Wahl vom individuellen Geschmack abhängen. Die Schwierigkeit liegt meines Erachtens

nach hier: Fast alle Äusserungen der Personen, selbst wenn sie auf den ersten Blick hin allgemeingültig erscheinen, sind so individuell gefärbt so aus dem Charakter des Sprechenden heraus empfunden, dass sie nicht in dem Sinne als Sentenzen gebraucht werden können, wie wir das z. B. bei Schiller und besonders im *Tell* finden.

Das gehört aber eigentlich nicht mehr hierher. Mir ist es, wie gesagt, um das Prinzip zu tun. Ist es ökonomisch erlaubt, immer von neuem Ausgabe auf Ausgabe zu häufen, wenn im Grunde kein Bedürfnis dafür vorliegt? Ist es pädagogisch nicht eine schreiende Sünde, "des allzualten, allzuwirren Wissens auf unsern Nacken vielgehäufte Last" auf junge Schultern weiterzuwälzen? Oder wenn dies Wissen für sie gar nicht bestimmt ist, sollte es nicht wichtig genug sein, dem Anfänger mit einer fasslichen, seinen Horizont nicht überschreitenden Abhandlung an die Hand zu gehn, ihn wirklich e i n z u f ü h r e n, statt ihn abzuschrecken? Denn ein wirres Zuviel spornt nicht an, es lähmt nur.

Auf der andern Seite darf man doch dem vorgerückten Studenten nicht alles Denken ersparen, indem man ihm die elementarsten Dinge einfach einlöffelt. Er wird sich sowieso dagegen sträuben und mit dem Unnötigen auch das Nötige unbeachtet lassen. Für ihn gelten weder die Übersetzungen, noch die grammatistischen Winke, noch die elementare Einleitung, die selbst für ein Repetitorium zu farblos ist.

Ich greife aus den vielen Beispielen, welche beweisen können, wie unmöglich es ist, zween Herren zu dienen, i. e. zwei verschiedenen Klassen von Schülern, nur noch ein Beispiel heraus:

Anmerkung zu I, 86: "The distinction between Verstand and Vernunft is due to the influence of Kant." Anmerkung zu I, 88: "Lockte die Neugier nicht, if curiosity did not entice! Note the inverted order to express condition with 'if' omitted."

Quousque tandem!

ERNST FEISE.

University of Wisconsin.

Heyse and his Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle, by Robert M. Mitchell, Ph. D. Frankfurt a/M., 1915. [Ottendorfer Series of Germanic Monographs, No. 4].

After showing how the word *Novelle* became naturalized in Germany between 1523 and 1798, Dr. Mitchell traces "the develop-

ment of the theory of the *Novelle* in Germany from its beginnings to what is, for the present at least, its culmination in Heyse's justly famous critical statement." For this purpose he divides his work into three different periods.

I. From the Schlegels to Young Germany, 1798-1834: By declaring "that the theme of the *Novelle* must be novel and striking," A. W. Schlegel gave "the theory of the Schlegels *in nuce*." He did this in 1798. Three years later his brother declared the species should combine '*Ironie*' with novelty in theme or in treatment, in which Dr. Mitchell sees paradox or extreme contrast, *i. e.*, "an ending which one is not led to expect from the beginning." Its style, moreover, should be that of the cultivated raconteur. Without clearly distinguishing between the *Novelle* and the novel, A. W. Schlegel later showed that the latter contains gradual development of character and plot, while the former eliminates all but the essential. This factor and the presence of 'decisive turning points' made him consider the *Novelle* like the drama. Once more he demanded that the theme should be some unusual and unique, yet typical and creditable occurrence. And the medium should be prose. In 1827 Goethe defined the *Novelle* as "eine sich ereignete, unerhörte Begebenheit." These words, however, were only the result of an investigation of over thirty years. They were based upon the following observations: the *Novelle*, novel in treatment or in theme and dealing with an unusual occurrence within the limits of real life, should have a theme single and epoch-making for the action, a structure approaching the unity of the poem, a development that leads toward extreme contrast, and the style of the raconteur in cultivated society. Two years later Tieck differentiated the *Novelle* from other prose tales. 'The turning point,' single and singular, formed, in his mind, the clear and decisive element: it sets the species apart from others and gives each story its individuality. Toward the end of the period Theodor Mundt based his theory upon a comparison of the *Novelle* with the novel. The novel, consisting of an indefinite series of events, appeared to him like a "straight line that begins or ends more or less indefinitely"; the *Novelle*, on the other hand, with its action "concentrated upon a central theme which imperatively demands one certain definite close and no other," he found like a "circle drawn about a center which controls the course of the line at every

point and determines the end absolutely." The one, moreover, has fixt characters, the other develops them.

II. From Young Germany to Heyse, 1834-1871: Hettner alone, by restating Tieck's theory, did the question justice; unlike the latter, however, he pointed also at the difference between the *Novelle* and the novel. Thruout the whole period Tieck had much influence, both in theory and in practice.

III. Heyse, 1871-1912: Without adding anything new or important, Heyse shaped the thoughts of his predecessors in a form that has stood the test of critics to this day. Like Mundt's, Heyse's theory rests chiefly upon a distinction between the novel and the *Novelle*. They differ in subject matter: the one treats "die Geschichte, nicht die Zustände, das Ereignis, nicht die sich in ihm abspielende Weltanschauung"; the other gives "ein Kultur- und Gesellschaftsbild im Großen, ein Weltbild im Kleinen." The former concentrates all light upon the central theme; the latter shows "ein gruppenweises Ineinandergreifen oder ein konzentrisches Sichumschlingen verschiedener Lebenskreise." As Mundt had used the simile of the straight line and the circle, Heyse summed up his theory in the two words: silhouette and falcon, the former like Mundt's circle, the latter much like Tieck's 'decisive turning point.'

Dr. Mitchell's work consists, for the most part, of a collection of quotations, arranged in chronological order and accompanied by comments and interpretations. A peculiar mixture of German and English is the result. The leaps from the one language to the other are so sudden and frequent that the reader is, at times, compelled to pass from German to English and again to German, or vice versa, in one and the same sentence. Such transitions make the reading anything but pleasing and frequently rather hard to follow.¹ Many of the quotations could have been profitably put at the foot of the page. With such an arrangement Dr. Mitchell would have had a better opportunity for a more connected exposition of each critic's contribution, as well as for more original work of his own. And the treatise would then have been hardly so long (107 pages). According to the general plan of the book the reader usually gets a large part of a contribution by way of anticipation,

¹ An illustration of this point is Mr. Goodnight's review in the *Journal of Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, xv, 633.

then follows the quotation, and finally the author sums it all up again in his own words. But that is not all, for another summing-up is given in the Conclusion. This waste of time and space appears at its worst in Dr. Mitchell's treatment of the Schlegels, where a comparison of the two contributors is yet added to the above scheme.

The nature of the subject and the method of treatment kept Dr. Mitchell from giving much that is original or new. He traces the theory of the *Novelle* and lets the critics speak for themselves. So much so, that fourteen pages of the thirty-two on Young Germany, for instance, are made up of quotations. And the same is true of the chapter on Heyse, for it consists, to a very large degree, of a close analysis of Heyse's Introduction to Vol. I of the *Novellenschatz*. The author never forgot the aim of his investigation and stuck to his subject from start on finish. The treatment of Spielhagen, running like a colored-line thru the entire book, now in the notes, now in the body of the discussion, alone seems peculiar. If Dr. Mitchell wisht to treat him, he should have been treated where he belonged. And Spielhagen, not Wieland, was the excuse for pulling in Robert Louis Stevenson on p. 22.

Over a dozen misprints came to my notice. The absence of a bibliography and an index of names is much to be regretted.

On the whole, Dr. Mitchell did his work very well according to his general outline and scheme. He gives a good idea of the development of the theory of the *Novelle* in Germany.

G. C. L. RIEMER.

Bucknell University.

The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio. By Hubertis M. Cummings. Princeton Dissertation. University of Cincinnati Studies, Vol. x, Part 2, 1916.

This is a wide and tempting field. No one interested in Chaucer, interested, indeed, in the story of English narrative-development, can read the title of Dr. Cummings' dissertation without a quickened and pleasurable expectancy. We have waited long for a thorough discussion of this subject.

And, as we have waited, our requirements have increased. It

is no longer sufficient that passages of Italian and of English should be paralleled, however exhaustively, nor that similes should be pursued beyond the farthest bounds of Italy to a yet remoter source. It is not even sufficient for us that the passivity of Troilus' character, the resiliency of Pandarus, in both Boccaccio and Chaucer, should be argued with painstaking care, and proved by citations. Our thoughts have widened with the process of the suns. He who would command our allegiance as he discusses the indebtedness of Chaucer to Boccaccio must do far more than would have been accepted twenty-five, or even fifteen, years ago. He must present the line-parallels, indeed, and he must analyze the plot and character-borrowings, but he must do far more than that. There is a debt of the letter, and there is a debt of the method and the spirit, and a poet may repeat the words of another without tuning himself to the borrowed note, or he may alter the key of his being and doing under such an influence. Where did Chaucer stand at the moment when Boccaccio's two longer poems became known to him? What were his conceptions of narrative movement, of character-grouping and contrast, of suggestion, restraint, and irony, when the great Italian narrator's influence made itself felt? With what that was already in Chaucer, of technical and of spiritual, did Boccaccio unite or differ? Did the new incentive find or not find in the English poet something that was already stirring towards these ends?

That is what we would know. And he who would answer these questions must be familiar with far more than the text of the two poets. One does not qualify for a monograph on Henry James by James alone. Neither is Chaucer a simple or a dependent person, for all his plain habit and unassuming manner. The student who would enlighten us on the relations between these two masters of narrative must not only have read and thought long in the French romances and fabliaux and many another field; he must see his subject from the angles of comparative literature and of the developing technique of narrative. Moreover, to that meticulous care in collecting, sifting, and arranging material which is supposedly German he must add the synthetizing vision, the clarity and felicity of expression, which are characteristic of the Frenchman, to whom the possession of language is an hourly joy. If he is without this latter, then let not the "debt" of one great artist to another tempt his effort.

Dr. Cummings has passed slowly and carefully through the first of these duties, and reports his conclusions. He does not find evidence to support the contentions of Karl Young, C. G. Child, J. S. P. Tatlock, and Pio Rajna that the *Filocolo*, the *Amorosa Visione*, the *Ameto* or the *Corbaccio* was known to Chaucer. The arguments of these scholars seem to Dr. Cummings insufficiently based, and he sets forth with care his destructive criticism. The half of the book, nearly 100 pages, is then devoted to discussion of the *Filostrato* and the *Teseide*. A line-by-line consideration of Chaucer's verbal debt to the *Filostrato* is followed by a lengthy analysis of character-portraiture in the two poems, and here it is that Dr. Cummings falls short of his own ideal and ours. A critic who writes of Troilus' passivity—"No surprise will be occasioned by one's witnessing the decay of his resolution on absolute secrecy at all costs, when the cajolery of Pandarus comes to play upon it"—is not writing faultlessly. What shall we say of a writer who tells us that Troilus stood, "the sweet irony of youth revelling on his lips?"—that Cressida, "torn between the despair she felt for Troy and the vanity she felt at having the attentions of another gallant man, fell"?

That a piece of writing is a dissertation does not set it outside the pale of style. Simplicity at least it should possess, not pompous penury of expression. Dr. Cummings has given us a good deal of honest work in a limited portion of the wide field indicated by his title, and he has presented a small amount of conclusions, mainly negative, as to the shorter poems of Boccaccio and the "Lollius" *crux*.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

Chicago.

Bibliography of the Dramatic Works of Lope de Vega Carpio based upon the Catalogue of John Rutter Chorley. By HUGO A. RENNERT. *Revue Hispanique*, Tome XXXIII, pp. 1-284.

The triumvirate of Spanish writers has fared badly at the hands of bibliographers. Cervantes has been served best, but as for Calderón and Lope de Vega, he who would study their works must first prepare his own bibliography or test and revise the information provided in the unsatisfactory publications of Breymann and Professor Rennert. In 1904 the latter published a version of Chor-

ley's bibliography in his *Life of Lope de Vega*. This I reviewed at some length in *Mod. Lang. Notes* (xxiv, 167-171, 198-204). Now we are provided with a new edition, which is in need of further revision. The following notes, based wholly on some early plays taken at random, will supply some of the necessary corrections. Some of the notes I owe to two of my students, Miss Anderson and Professor Lipari.

Arcadia (La). Rennert says that it is in P². This statement is not made in the previous edition. R. may be right (*cf.* p. 120 n.), but Menéndez y Pelayo states that it is not in the P. lists, and I fail to find it in my editions of 1773 and 1776.

Arenal (El) de Sevilla. This is in P. There is a 'gracioso': he is funny, and, in accordance with the usual formula, marries at the close of the play.

Atalanta (La). Why star this play? Under *Adonis y Venus* (mentioned in P.) there ought to be a cross reference to *La Atalanta*.

Contienda (La) de García de Paredes. In P. but not in P².

Cordovés (El) valeroso, Pedro Carbonero. Not in P², according to the list published on p. 122. In P. we have *Pedro Carbonero* (p. 106).

Francesilla (La). This play, in which the 'gracioso' appears for the first time according to Lope, was written in 1598. The date can easily be determined by allusions to events that occurred in that year. I take occasion here to announce that my pupil and colleague Professor Lipari has undertaken a study of the 'gracioso' in the Spanish drama.

Guzmanes (Los) de Toral. Not in P. If Restori's conjecture is well founded, this play is in P. under its second title.

Hermosura (La) aborrecida. Accessible in Hartzenbusch's edition, II, 95.

Locos (Los) de Valencia. This well-known play is also in H., I, 113.

Lo que pasa en una tarde. R. says "inedited (?)." The play was published by Petrof in 1906.

Maestro (El) de danzar. Elsewhere (p. 49), R. says there is no 'gracioso.'

Nacimiento (El) de Ursón y Valentín. Mentioned twice in P. Reference is there made to a second part.

Pastoral (La) de Jacinto. This whole paragraph needs to be

revised. The matter is stated incorrectly in the *Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 13 n. Montalván declared that this was Lope's first play in three acts.

Perro (El) del hortelano. The proverb is more correctly: *Como el perro del hortelano que ni come las berzas ni las deja comer á otro* (Covarrubias).

Pobreza (La) estimada. R. says: "In the concluding verses the alternative title is given as *La Riqueza mal nacida*." Is it?

Prisión (La) sin Culpa. Tristán is a 'gracioso.'

Tres (Los) Diamantes. Allow me to do some proof-reading: "En fin ya somos casados [read: *cuñados*]. At this point Crispin comes forward with the question—"Quien llama?" This scene [read: *this one line*—as far as the words . . . should be placed earlier [read: *later*], as at the end of [read: *in*]. . . ."

Vaquero (El) de Morana. Why insert pedantic misinformation from Sarmiento?

Virtud, Pobreza y Mujer. R. says, "The comedia must have been written after July 25, 1607, the date of Pedro Liñan's death." As it also refers to the expulsion of the Moors, it must have been written after 1609-1610.

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Toronto.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENT IN *Le Père Goriot*

Émile Faguet in his volume on Balzac¹ criticizes the novelist for his lengthy descriptions, while assenting to his theory (as set forth in the preface of *La Comédie Humaine*, 1842) that character is the product of environment so far as to say (p. 60) *qu'il est essentiel pour faire connaître l'animal humain de me décrire son habitat et que la maison explique l'habitant*. He goes on to say, however, that often Balzac's descriptions of dwellings do not explain characters, taking as an illustration *Le Père Goriot* and its extended description of Mme. Vauquer's boarding-house:

Les personnages essentiels du *Père Goriot*, sont Goriot, Rastignac et Vautrin. Tous les trois sont à la pension Vauquer par suite des circonstances et la pension Vauquer n'a eu et n'a aucune espèce d'influence sur leur caractère et, par conséquent, est absolument

¹ Émile Faguet, *Balzac*, Paris, 1913, p. 59 f.

inutile. La maison Vauquer n'explique uniquement que Mme Vauquer. Balzac dit lui-même: "Toute sa personne explique la pension, comme la pension implique sa personne." Oui bien, mais il n'y a qu'elle que la pension implique ou explique et elle est le personnage le moins important du roman. Dès lors la description est inutile. (P. 60.)

But it is not the correspondence of Mme Vauquer with her environment that is the most important application of Balzac's theory in this novel. The Maison Vauquer and its inmates are a portion of the environment of young Eugène de Rastignac, whose changing fortunes divide with the sorrows of Old Goriot the attention and sympathy of the reader. Balzac's older characters do not change when once their habits of life have become fixed. In the novel in question it is not Mme Vauquer, Old Goriot and Vautrin who develop, it is Eugène. Arriving unspoiled from the provinces, he has his eyes opened to Parisian life, and his life purposes and interests change as he becomes aware of the luxuries of life and the accepted means by which they were procured in the society of which he had recently become a part. It is by contrasting his home life and the Maison Vauquer with the elegance and comfort in which Mme de Beauséant, Mme de Restaud and Mme de Nucingen lived that he came to make his definite resolve to make his way in the world and procure for himself the same material satisfactions they possessed.

Eugène began, like other students, by envying the luxury of the occupants of the carriages on the Champs-Élysées, and by comparing it with the simplicity and financial distress of his own family in the provinces (*Le Père Goriot*, Lévy edition, p. 26). The first result, a very transitory one, was to arouse him to work: *Il s'était mis sous le charme d'une fausse énergie en voyant les splendeurs du monde* (p. 27). It was at Mme de Beauséant's that he caught his first glimpse of a luxurious interior: *Il allait donc voir pour la première fois les merveilles de cette élégance personnelle qui trahit l'âme et les mœurs d'une femme de distinction* (p. 56). Its effect upon him was immediate: *Le démon du luxe le mordit au cœur, la fièvre du gain le prit, la soif de l'or lui sécha la gorge* (p. 59). Returning to the Maison Vauquer, the importance of whose detailed description is now apparent, he was struck by the disagreeable contrast, and his ambition received a new impulse:

Arrivé rue Neuve-Sainte-Geneviève, il . . . vint dans cette salle à manger nauséabonde, où il aperçut, comme des animaux à un râtelier, les dix-huit convives en train de se repaître. Le spectacle de ces misères et l'aspect de cette salle lui furent horribles. La transition était trop brusque, le contraste trop complet, pour ne pas développer outre mesure chez lui le sentiment de l'ambition. D'un côté, les fraîches et charmantes images de la nature sociale la plus élégante, des figures jeunes, vives, encadrées par les mer-

veilles de l'art et du luxe, des têtes passionnées, pleines de poésie; de l'autre, de sinistres tableaux bordés de fange, et des faces où les passions n'avaient laissé que leurs cordes et leur mécanisme. . . . Rastignac résolut d'ouvrir deux tranchées parallèles pour arriver à la fortune, de s'appuyer sur la science et sur l'amour, d'être un savant docteur et un homme à la mode (p. 70).

Mme de Béauseant invites Eugène to dinner, and the contrast again overwhelms him:

Mais, en voyant cette argenterie sculptée, et les mille recherches d'une table somptueuse, en admirant pour la première fois un service fait sans bruit, il était difficile à un homme d'ardente imagination de ne pas préférer cette vie constamment élégante à la vie de privations qu'il voulait embrasser le matin. Sa pensée le rejeta pendant un moment dans sa pension bourgeoise; il en eut une si profonde horreur, qu'il se jura de la quitter. . . . (pp. 103, 104).

His final conversion to the doctrine of material success comes with his establishment as Delphine's lover in the apartment which her father has furnished for them:

Il avait continuellement hésité à franchir le Rubicon parisien. . . . Néanmoins, ses derniers scrupules avaient disparu la veille, quand il s'était vu dans son appartement. En jouissant des avantages matériels de la fortune, . . . il avait dépouillé sa peau d'homme de province, et s'était doucement établi dans une position d'où il découvrait un bel avenir (p. 190).

It was therefore the effect of the contrast between his humble provincial home and impossible Parisian boarding-house, and the life of comparative luxury of which he had glimpses, that aroused the worldly ambition of Eugène de Rastignac and inspired him to utter the challenge expressed in his final words, spoken from the heights of the Père-Lachaise cemetery as he gazed down upon the fashionable quarter of the city: *A nous deux maintenant!* (p. 244).

STANLEY L. GALPIN.

Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

VITZLIPUTZLI

I wish to add another note to my previous remarks on Vitzliputzli which have appeared in various numbers of the *Modern Language Notes*.

In some of the German puppet plays which dealt with the story of Faust, a Vitzliputzli seems to have been one of the stock figures. As appears from announcements of performances in different parts of Germany during the nineteenth century, he was variously represented in such plays as "one of the devils," "one of the spirits,"

"one of the spirits of hell." In Engel's *Das Volksschauspiel Doctor Johann Faust*, Oldenburg 1882, the following variants of the name appear: Vitzliputzli, Vizlipuzli, Virzlipurzli, Fitzliputzli, Witzliputzili, Vicipuzel, Vitzebutzelio.

It was only natural to suppose that the name Vitzliputzli—derived from the name of the Aztec deity Huitzilopochtli—made its entrance into Germany by way of Spain. Several pieces of evidence seem to confirm this conjecture. In the first place, the name of the Mexican god is frequently mentioned by Spanish historical writers of the sixteenth century.¹ Moreover, some of their works, as I find, were early translated into German.

A second bit of evidence, of more or less confirmatory value, is reported by Häutle in the *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg*, VIII. On the authority of the catalogue of exhibits issued by the Münchener Kunstkammer, he states that the Spanish Cardinal Francisco Ximinez (1436-1517) once sent to Munich a Mexican idol of blue glass; we are further informed that it possessed large eyes and "showed a greater resemblance to a devil than to a human being." Presumably this was a representation of the god Huitzilopochtli (Vitzliputzli); in any event, the name came to be attached to the figure, as I infer from Birlinger's note. In view of the unengaging aspect of the idol, as described above, it seems natural enough that the name of the heathen god should have been seized upon as a welcome euphemistic designation for the devil.

An early occurrence of the name in German literature remains to be noted. As pointed out by Birlinger, the form Vizli Puzli appears in the *Evangelium Reformatum, Abermahl neu lustiges Gespräch zwischen dem Teuffel und dreyen Ketzern*, ed. Joh. Münch, of which the first edition appeared in 1617. The author is dealing with Luther's death and supposed descent into hell. The German reformer is pictured as suffering the most horrible agonies of hell "dass man mit im wol tausend Kinder sol zu Bette getrieben und schlaffen verjaget haben." The Calvinist speaks: "Wer Teuffel sol sich auch für solches Monstrum und grausames ungeheur nicht erschrecken. Wan er in diser Gestalt des Abends einstens hinter die Widertauffer käme, wie sol die neunte Stund so bald gehört werden. Mit was grossem getümmel wurden sie häufig, wie ein Heerd Schaaf, alt und jung, nach ihrem Schlaffkämmerlein lauffen, noch ärger als wann der Vizli Puzli da wäre!"

In conclusion it may be of interest to refer to a book by Paula and Richard Dehmel, bearing the title: *Fitzebutze. Allerhand Schnickschnack für Kinder*. Mit Bildern von Ernst Kreidolf. Neue verb. Aufl. Schafstein & Comp., Köln, Weihnachten, 1901.²

¹ Cf. A. Birlinger in *Alemannia*, XIII (1885). My attention was drawn to this note by Dr. Archer Taylor of Washington University.

² This reference comes to me from Prof. K. J. Grimm of Pennsylvania College.

Aside from various other uses to which it has been put,³ the corrupted name of the cruel heathen deity, as we see, is now made to do service even as a harmless, playful title wherewith to adorn a Christmas book for children.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

State University of Iowa.

To the various notes of Prof. Ibershoff on Vitzliputzli may be added the following details: Grimmshausen in his didactic monograph *Simplicissimi Galgenmännlein*, has in the third chapter an extended reference to the Mexican god in question: "Der böss Geist hat in America bei den Mexicanern dem gantz Israelitischen Zug aus Aegypten nachgeöff, sich auch dardurch und hernach bey dem selbn Volck untr dem Namn des Vizli Buzli in grossm ansehn als ein Gott erhalten und viel Mord und Unglück, auch sonst gross Wundr gstift abt die Hinkunfft der Christn hat sein Btrug entdeckt und durch Gotts Gnad sein falschen Götzn-Dienst zerstört."

A very poor drama by a certain Rosenau, which treats the story of Fouqué's *Galgenmännlein* and was produced in Vienna in 1817, bears the name of *Vizlipuzli*. The title seems to have been suggested by the passage above quoted.¹

TAYLOR STARCK.

Smith College.

BYRON AND GRAY

In the year 1852 there was published by the Armenian Academy of St. Lazarus, in Venice, the following work:

Beauties | of English Poets | [Two lines in Armenian.] | [Emblem.] | Venice | In the Island of S. Lazzaro | 1852 |

It is a 16mo volume, pp. xv, [1], 233. It is now extremely rare; I know of but one copy, that in the Harvard University Library. Mr. Ernest Hartley Coleridge was not aware of its existence when he compiled his *Bibliography of Byron (Byron's Works, Poetry vii. 149)*. He there cites a later edition entitled, *Lord Byron's Armenian Exercises and Poetry*, and dated on the title-page 1886 and on the yellow wrapper 1870. The latter is an octavo, pp. 171, [1].

The contents of the two editions are not identical. The contents of the earlier volume are as follows:

Lord Byron's English and Armenian handwriting, p. [iii].
From Byron's letters, [the proposed preface to his edition of an

³ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxviii, 211-212, and xxxi, 506-507.

² See the article of Ludwig in *Euphorion*, xvii, 613 ff.

Armenian grammar, dated] Jan. 2, 1817, to Moore, Dec. 5, 1816, to Murray, Dec. 4, 1816, pp. iv-xv. Lord Byron's Translations (into Armenian, including pieces of Armenian history, part of a synodical discourse by St. Nierses of Lampron, the Epistle of the Corinthians to St. Paul, and Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians), pp. [1]-41. Lord Byron's "Poetries": The Destruction of Sennacherib, Address to the Ocean, On Waterloo, To Time, Stanzas Composed During a Thunder-Storm, Church of St. Peter, pp. [43]-105. Pope's Ode on St. Cecilia's Day and Messiah, pp. [107]-147. Gray's Elegy and Ode on the Death of a Favorite Cat, pp. [149]-185. From the Christian Year, Morning and Evening, pp. 187-211. From Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy, pp. [213]-225. From Paradise Lost, i. 1-32, pp. [227]-233. English and Armenian on opposite pages.

I have not seen the later edition; but according to Mr. Coleridge's description, it contains at least one piece, *To the Duke of Dorset*, which is not in the other volume.

My interest in the book was aroused by the fact that it had been described to me as consisting "of Lord Byron's Armenian translation of poems and letters by himself and others, including Gray's Elegy, etc." From this it would appear that Byron was himself the author of the Armenian translation of the *Elegy* and the *Ode on the Death of a Favorite Cat* which we find in these pages. Was such the case?

On inspecting the volume, we are constrained to reply in the negative. From the list of contents given above it will be seen that one section is labeled Lord Byron's Translations; it fills only 41 pages, a little more than one-sixth of the whole. The natural inference is that Byron did not write any of the other translations.

The question then arises, can any light be thrown on the authorship of these other translations? Did Byron's teacher, Father Pasquale Aucher, have any hand in them? Or do they all date from a time subsequent to both Byron and Aucher? Byron's letters throw no light on the point. Possibly Mackay's *Lord Byron at the Armenian Convent* (London, 1876) may have something on this question; I have not access to this.

Byron's fondness for Gray is well known. As anyone can see from going through Coleridge and Prothero's indexes, there are frequent quotations from and echoes of Gray in Byron's works. His interest in Gray extended beyond the latter's writings. For example, in his letter to Leigh Hunt, November, 1815, Byron says:

"I have heard that [Gray] was afflicted by an incurable and very grievous distemper, though not generally known."

But even if Byron did not make these translations himself, it is possible to suppose that it was indirectly due to him and his passing interest in Armenian studies that Gray's two poems were rendered into this ancient Asiatic tongue—the language, as the monks

themselves believed, of the Terrestrial Paradise. For if Byron had not sojourned at the monastery as he did in 1816-17, it is possible that the attention of the monks might not have been turned in the direction of his writings and those of the other authors in whom he was especially interested.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

BYRON AND SHELLEY

There is evidence in Byron's poetry of some kind of relation between him and Shelley in the matter of the idea of Prometheus. The two poets first met in 1816, during Shelley's trip on the Continent with Mary Godwin and Jane Claremont. In the words of Richard Garnett (*D. N. B.*, s. v. Shelley), "Byron's poetry, to its great advantage, was deeply influenced by his new friendship." From this epoch, July, 1816, dates Byron's poem *Prometheus*, some lines of which strikingly anticipate Shelley's interpretation of the myth of the rebellious Titan; the following will serve as examples:

Titan! to whose immortal eyes
The sufferings of mortality,
Seen in their sad reality,
Were not as things that gods despise;

Titan! to thee the strife was given
Between the suffering and the will,
Which torture where they cannot kill;
And the inexorable Heaven,
And the deaf tyranny of Fate,
The ruling principle of Hate,
Which for its pleasure doth create
The things it may annihilate,
Refused thee even the boon to die:

Thy Godlike crime was to be kind,
To render with thy precepts less
The sum of human wretchedness,
And strengthen Man with his own mind;

Thou art a symbol and a sign
To Mortals of their fate and force.

Again in *Manfred*, I, 2, the hero's soliloquy on the cliffs of the Jungfrau at sunrise shows an anticipation of the opening soliloquy of Prometheus in Shelley's poem; both, of course, derive from the apostrophe, "O dios aither," in *Æschylus' Prometheus Bound*. The point to be noted is that *Manfred* preceded *Prometheus Un-*

bound by two years. Then, when we compare the passage beginning,—

My mother Earth!
And thou fresh breaking Day, and you, ye Mountains,
Why are ye beautiful? I cannot love ye,
And thou, the bright eye of the universe
That openest over all, and unto all
Art a delight . . .

from Byron, with that from *Prometheus Unbound*, Act I, beginning,—

I ask the Earth, have not the mountains felt?
I ask yon Heaven, the all-beholding Sun,
Has it not seen? . . .

we are confronted with the question, which of the two poets inspired the other. The evidence of the poems points toward Byron as the original, in that in 1816 he had written a poem setting up Prometheus as the prototype and symbol of the liberators of the human mind, and in 1817 had embodied an imitation of perhaps the most striking passage of the Greek tragedy in a lyrical drama of his own.

On the other hand, in Mrs. Shelley's *Note on the Poems of 1816*, to be found in most editions of Shelley, "the *Prometheus of Æschylus*" occurs in the list of books read during that eventful year. Does it not, then, seem better in accord with what we know of these two poets to suppose that Shelley read the play of Æschylus and saw clearly the significance of the figure of Prometheus for the world of the Restoration, that he talked about it with Byron in Switzerland, and that the more facile poet gave the earlier expression to ideas which he must have regarded as developed in common? The figure of Prometheus made a lasting impression on Byron's mind, for in 1823 he compares Napoleon at St. Helena to Prometheus,—

Hear! hear Prometheus from his rock appeal
To earth, air, ocean, all that felt or feel
His power and glory. . . .

The Age of Bronze, v.

Certainly here is a neat little problem in sources and origins.

LLEWELLYN M. BUELL.

Yale University.

TWO BORROWINGS OF WORDSWORTH

William Wordsworth is not usually set down as one of that company, including Shakspeare and other less illustrious ones, who, to use Montaigne's phrase, take their own where they find it. Such poetic borrowings and hints as he made use of he was generally careful to acknowledge in his notes. We find him telling of suggestions from the writings of Shakspeare, Milton, Scott, Lady Winchelsea, and even such comparatively little known authors as Sir John Beaumont, brother of the dramatist, and Rev. Joseph Simpson. There are two instances of apparent indebtedness, however, which neither he nor his editors, so far as I have been able to discover, have ever pointed out.

The first is the opening lines of the sonnet beginning

With how sad steps, O moon, thou climb'st the sky,
"How silently, and with how wan a face!"

They are the exact words of the first two lines of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, Sonnet XXI, except that Sidney uses the plural "skies." Wordsworth was probably aware that he was quoting, as is shown by his putting the second line in quotation-marks, while the first, which varies slightly from Sidney, is not so marked. That his thoughts were on Sidney at the time is indicated by his statement in the notes that a line and a half in the sonnet entitled "November, 1806," written in the same year, were suggested by "words in Lord Brooke's Life of Sir P. Sidney."

Beyond the opening lines the sonnets show no similarity, either in thought or phrasing. Just why Wordsworth did not see fit to ascribe them to their proper source is not quite clear. Probably he considered Sidney's sonnet too well known to require this acknowledgment, and took the first two lines as a suitable point of departure for his own verse.

At the beginning of the noble *Ode to Duty*, the poet apostrophizes duty as

Stern daughter of the voice of God!

This expression, which has occasioned some discussion, I believe finds its inspiration also in the writings of one of his predecessors. One editor¹ suggests that by "the voice of God," Wordsworth "probably means conscience." This explanation seems most in accord with the thought of the poem; and the idea is borne out by a passage in *Paradise Lost*, ix, 651-53. Eve, in explaining the injunction not to touch the fruit of the tree, says to the serpent:

¹ Gayley, *English Poetry: Its Principles and Progress*, p. 523.

But of this tree we may not taste nor touch;
God so commanded, and left that command
Sole daughter of his voice.

Wordsworth's reverence for Milton and familiarity with his works are well known. It is possible that he may not have recalled at the time this expression of Eve's, in giving duty, awakened by conscience, as the reason for her refusal to partake of the forbidden fruit. But the similarity is so apparent that it is difficult to escape the conclusion that, whether he was conscious of it or not, this speech of Eve suggested to the poet the first line of his great ode.

W. H. VANN.

Columbia University.

A PARALLEL IN LITERARY BIOGRAPHY

John Keats and Joseph Rodman Drake naturally do not suggest each other; one is a noted English poet, the other a somewhat forgotten writer of American verse. A close examination, however, of the lives of these two men reveals a similarity in several details which furnishes a striking literary coincidence.

Keats was born in 1795 and died in 1821. Drake was born in 1795 and died in 1820. Both poets, in their early years, were familiar with poverty. Both of them were poets from childhood. Keats was a licensed surgeon before he engaged in poetical composition as his professional work. Drake graduated in medicine before he wrote any of his best-known pieces, including *The American Flag*. Keats contracted consumption and went to Italy in search of health. Drake developed the same disease and visited Louisiana in the hope of driving off what his friend Halleck called "consumption's ghastly form." Both men failed in the fight for life.

Although there is nothing in the works of these two poets, aside from the romantic spirit, to constitute a literary parallel, either by accident or influence, the biographical facts nevertheless record two pathetic life-histories being worked out at almost exactly the same time on opposite sides of the Atlantic. Just as we speculate about the work Keats might have done in later life, we may wonder what Drake's full contribution to American poetry would have been had he not gone the way of Adonais himself.

WILLIAM EBEN SCHULTZ.

Christian University.

BRIEF MENTION

The Social Criticism of Literature, by Gertrude Buck (Yale University Press, 1916). This is a booklet of only sixty pages, but it contains matter enough to inform the average reader of much that pertains to the theories and principles of literary criticism and the function of the critic. The treatise may, conceivably, be widely welcomed, for a large class of readers is usually ready to be captivated by the promise of a very brief exposition of a profoundly important subject. This preference for little books on large subjects is, for obvious reasons, not to be regretted,—publishers of the shilling-series value it in their own way,—but it is also to be guarded against, in so far as it may be symptomatic of superficiality, of a disposition to evade assiduous effort. Writers of elementary text-books are peculiarly exposed to the temptation—too often not resisted—to save the pupil's effort by excessive brevity, simplification, and dilution at the cost of impairing the wholeness and lowering the dignity of the subject handled.

By distinguishing the plastic arts as the arts of space and rest from the rhythmic arts as the arts of time and movement, one directs special attention (leaving aside the art of music) to the office of the reader, not only of poetry but of all forms of writing. The act of reading is to be considered as the process by which a composition in any department of the art of writing is made complete and effective. This coöperation of author and reader should be well taught in the schools, and it should be kept in mind steadfastly by the general reader so that his reading may be profitable in a worthy sense, and that he may be less prone to stand in indiscriminate awe of the reputed 'well-read' man,—a designation that is not forthrightly interchangeable with 'well-informed' or 'well-poised.' To teach reading should mean to teach a sympathetic approximation to the act of creating the composition; and the reader of whatever class of writings should thruout life grow in this power of sympathetic and unbiassed approximation. The application of this indicated test to large classes of readers would undeniably reveal a discouraging prevalence of feeble and uncertain notions of what constitutes right reading, and one may reasonably suspect that this result is in some measure due to an excess of codified professionalism in the methods of teaching literature in the schools and colleges. More right reading, aiming at personal appreciation and the completion of the author's creative act would enable the teacher to obviate much idle questioning of the value of the study of literature, and furnish occasion for pertinent instruction in how to think and how to exercise the imagination constructively. In the average mind the words culture and æsthetic appreciation would thus inevitably take on more of the

deep meaning of what is essential to well-ordered habits of the mind. No doctrine is more in need of inculcation than that of the practical value of a sure and refined sense of intellectual and social proprieties, which is not the fastidiousness of a Bembo, but the good taste that betokens the enlightened mind.

It is not digressing from the specific subject of the book in hand to offer reflections on the true meaning of reading, for Miss Buck interprets right reading as the gate-way to right criticism. The suspected digression may now be justified by direct citation: "The essential character of reading, whether elementary or advanced in its type, is found in no mere perfunctory turning of leaves, but in active participation, however limited it may be, in the experience which the writer would communicate. One reads, in any real sense of the word, only in so far as he thinks the writer's thoughts after him under the stimulus of his words, sees what the writer saw, feels what the writer felt" (p. 20). "In some sense one must, as Ruskin says, in order to read at all, ascend to the writer's level. . . . One must approximate the writer's position in order even to begin to read him. . . . The active minded reader finds that, in order to think the writer's thought after him, he must, for a time in very truth, be the writer. He must reconstruct the writer's *milieu*, social, industrial, political, and the writer's individual life as thus determined, or fail fully to apprehend the thought which grew out of and was modified by this particular set of conditions. And he must furthermore know the writer's tools, the form with which he worked, its limitations and possibilities" (p. 21 f.). As to the interrelation of reading and criticism, in the same context: "Reading begins the process of criticism at the impressionistic stage. . . . It is true that only in the degree of his training and sensitiveness has the reader's reaction value for anyone else. But this training and sensitiveness are by no means fixed quantities. They develop in and through the very act of reading." . . . "the simple, unanalytic process of reading [may] pass by imperceptible degrees into the furthest reaches of that extremely complex activity called criticism."

Hitherto, is the assumption, the theories of criticism have been at variance with each other, rending a seamless robe into shreds (p. 31); "but a new commandment has been given by social criticism, namely, that the critic, having reached [by good reading] conclusions for himself, shall then hold them as essentially tentative and personal, not only refusing steadfastly to impose them upon other readers, but giving no sanction to their use by any reader as a substitute for his own critical activity. This is indeed a hard saying, for the critic as well as for the reader; and it can be fulfilled by the critic only as he definitely acknowledges his primary obligation to help, not hinder, the reading of others" (p. 51). Taken together, the passages cited must give a clear notion of the particular point of this treatise. A precise definition of social

criticism does not seem to be possible because of its complex implications. This complexity is due to the admission of the contributory value of all preceding theories and methods of critical study and evaluation, which are here reviewed with comment, which is, however, at places marred by a touch of rather inappropriate sprightliness, betokening lurking prejudice against some methods of study, and a too sparing recognition of the principle of division of labor adopted by scholars to secure the valid whole. But if Miss Buck's pages be subjected, as they should be, to "genuine reading," the act on which she places so strong an emphasis, all will willingly be allowed to pass for the sake of submission to an enthusiastic discussion of the relation of reader to critic and of critic to reader.

Logically "social criticism" is not to be placed in the category of methods described as deductive, inductive, æsthetic, etc.; it merely concerns the motive that should impel the critic. A new stress is thus put on the old truth that a composition attains its varying degrees of finality in the effect produced on the reader, the completest reading producing the completest effect; and the timeliness of the lessons to be drawn from this discussion may be supposed to be undeniable. Surely many a reader and many a teacher of literature might, by this little book, be induced to put a higher value on the act and discipline of reading, and it should just as surely help the professional critic to execute with greater zeal the social function of mediating between author and reader.

J. W. B.

James Macpherson's Fragments of Ancient Poetry (1760). In diplomatischem Neudruck, mit den Lesarten der Umarbeitungen. Hrsg. von Otto L. Jiriczek (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 47; Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1915). Excepting an extremely rare and rather inadequate publication of the Aungervyle Society (Edinburgh, 1881, privately printed, only 150 copies), this first specimen of Ossianic poetry has not hitherto been accessible to scholars. The original sixteen fragments are now offered in a strictly diplomatic reprint, with a short introduction and a complete list of the variant readings of the early editions, particularly of the three issues of 1760, *Fingal* (1762), and of the *Poems of Ossian* (1773). Some of the variants are noteworthy for showing Macpherson's growing tendency to impair by over-refinement the primitive soberness of the fragments.

W. F.

Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian. By Torild A. Arnoldson (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1915. xii + 217 pp. Linguistic Studies in Germanic, Edited by Francis A. Wood, No. II). This book presents to us an imposing collection of semantic synonyms. The purpose is not to furnish an

etymological dictionary of words denoting parts of the body, nor the semasiologic development of such words in the usual sense of the term, but rather to trace the rise of the varied ideas expressive of the human body, in Gothic, Old and Modern Norse, and in the older West Germanic dialects. The process, in fact, is "different." Instead of a search for root-relationships, as Old Norse *hofuð*, Old English *hafud*, Sanskrit *kapālam*, Latin *caput*, Lithuanian *kāpas*, etc., or following up the varied fortunes of such words as OE. *cēace*, 'cheek,' originally 'swelling,' but to-day 'impudence, front, brass'; OE. *heorte*, 'heart,' become thru international loan-translation 'courage, resolution,'—the lexical aspects of the parts of the body are scrutinized with respect to their primary significations. Granted the 'head.' The question is, what original meanings, thru later restriction or extension, developed the ultimate idea corresponding to 'head'? We learn that the concept of 'head' in the Germanic languages grew out of such disjointed notions as 'top, summit,' 'edge, projection,' 'dot, point,' 'round object: ball, bowl, pot, mound, nut,' 'brain-bowl, brain-place,' 'lump,' 'shell,' 'bare spot,' 'something ruffled, tousled,' 'scurf' and 'covering'; and on the basis of MHG. *gebel* 'head,' *schedel* 'skull,' *houbet* 'head' we can collect such a varied crew of semantically cognate words as OE. *gafol* 'fork,' *scēap* 'sheath,' OBret. *scott* 'shield,' OPers. *kaufa* 'mountain.'

Separate chapters are assigned to the Head, Limbs, Trunk, Organs and such miscellaneous parts as 'nerve,' 'marrow,' etc. The words are arranged according to the respective parts of the body, and under each part the groups of meanings, in etymological units, so that a sample entry appears as follows: (Limbs: Toe:) "Point, Digit: ON. *tá*, Sw. *tå*, Dan. *taa*, OE. *tā*, *tāhe*, MLG. *tē*, OFris. *tāne*, OHG. *zēha*, MHG. *zēhe* toe: ON. *tjá* zeigen, mitteilen, Goth. *-teihan*, Gr. *δείκνυμι* zeige, Lat. *dico* sage, *digitus*, etc. Cf. Walde² 233 with references." And since the book is full of such entries and consists of nothing but such entries, it is barren in appearance. Albeit interesting in spots, it does not make interesting reading, any more than a dictionary would. One is convinced that it possesses more than the modicum of usefulness ordinarily inherent in such semantic studies; but, without formulation of laws or the drawing of conclusions, it seems to have voluntarily surrendered a good part of its right to existence. Might not the author have succumbed to the temptation of appending at least a brief summary of inferences? How and why the primary concepts evolve into the later functions; suitable citations for the more striking cases as e. g. 'mass, heap' > 'mouth'; 'sight, look' > 'cheek'; 'tube, pipe' > 'arm'; 'bread-hand' > 'left hand'; 'healing-finger, name-finger, nameless finger, gold-finger, poor-finger' > 'ring-finger,' etc.; classifications of how the same concept, such as 'top, summit' becomes 'head,' 'brain,' 'neck'; 'mass' becomes used for 'shoulder,' 'brain,' 'mouth,' 'kidney,'

etc? In the absence of such deductions, the work, tho of decided merit, seems to be a mere compilation from the various dictionaries listed in the bibliography, in which the author's own part is not sufficiently emphasized.

A. G.

Dr. Carl A. Krause's *Direct Method in Modern Languages*, Contributions to Methods and Didactics in Modern Languages (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1916), is not only a highly valuable "theoretical" contribution to Modern Language Methodology, but it is a real help to those teachers who seek practical advice and guidance. The Direct Method has made rapid progress in the last few years, the need of reform being felt everywhere. As a result, theoretical and also stimulating discussions have been going on for some time, but comparatively little has been done by the older and more experienced modern language teachers in giving help and useful advice to the younger generation of their colleagues. The Universities, with a few exceptions, do not train the prospective language teacher in any practical and pedagogical way, at least not in special methodology, so that very frequently the young and inexperienced teacher must find his way alone and struggle along as best he can.

Dr. Krause, for many years a leader in the reform movement, has fully appreciated this need, and has come to the assistance of those desiring practical advice based upon *experience* and *real conditions*, as much as the printed word will permit. His book gives all the information that a modern language teacher is anxious to obtain, and reveals on almost every page the practical school-man, whose advice may be followed safely. We see that the author is intimately acquainted with the real needs of our schools, with the actual conditions of the classroom, and that he is therefore in a position to do much more than to discuss merely *in theory* the important issues and aims.

His critical remarks are sound and to the point. "The trouble," he says, "with many of our school grammars is that they carry too much dead wood which may be of interest and value to the specialist, but not to schoolboys and schoolgirls, who are in no position to assimilate doctoral dissertations" (page 60). Or: "The too hasty striving after the classics is an abomination. If we want to behold a solid, beautiful superstructure, we must have a stable basis. Travelling at railroad speed through the fields of language prevents our going botanizing" (page 61).

Dr. Krause's sound defense of the reform should appeal to every "real, live teacher." Speaking of the Direct Method, he says: "It teaches the language, and not merely about the language, as is done by the indirect procedure." May this excellent book come into the hands of every language teacher!

A. K.